

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OVERVIEW

The Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP), acting as the State Administrative Agency (SAA) and under the direction of the Governor, with the support of the Legislature, provides support and technical assistance for criminal and juvenile justice agencies, local victim services, and community crime prevention programs, schools, community-based organizations, and training programs for prosecutors and public defenders. OCJP also administers grant funding for State and local units of government and private nonprofit organizations, and:

- Supports the development of state-of-the-art approaches for the criminal justice system and victim service programs;
- Provides technical assistance to assure effective program management;
- Disseminates information on successful program models and current/emerging research findings;
- Promotes interdisciplinary information exchange and support between criminal and juvenile justice agencies, and public and private organizations; and
- Develops publications on crime prevention, crime suppression, victimology, and victim services for statewide distribution.

As well as being the SAA, OCJP remains committed to leading the fight against crime and drug abuse and making California a safer place to live and work. Programmatically, OCJP is organized into six program branches: Anti-Drug Abuse, Gang Violence Suppression, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence, Violence Against Children, and the Victim/Witness Assistance branches.

The Anti-Drug Abuse (ADA) Act of 1986, including subsequent reauthorizations, established formula block grants to the states for the purpose of anti-drug abuse enforcement efforts. Federal Fiscal Year 1997 marks the 11th year of federal funding by the Byrne Memorial Formula Block Grant Program. With continued federal funding, OCJP has been able to maintain the Multi-component grant program concept that encompasses 57 of the 58 counties.

The ADA program model includes the major components of the criminal justice system: law enforcement, prosecution, probation, with the courts as an optional element. Under this program, local and state drug enforcement efforts are concentrated on the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, and supervision of gang-related, street level, mid-level, and major drug traffickers. All components implement selected program strategies that correspond with 12 of the 26 federally authorized program purpose areas.

OCJP has taken a step further to convert these strategies into program titles or emphasis areas that approach every possible facet of bringing resources, planning strategies, and resulting efforts on the problems of violence and drugs. Program emphasis continues to be modified yearly, as improvements and changes in program focus are determined necessary.

Further, the ADA Multi-Component Enforcement Program was established to aid state and local criminal justice agencies by improving their capacities to combat illegal drug and drug-related crimes of violence. Each county in California receives funds to implement the ADA Multi-Component Enforcement Program. Applicants must prepare a countywide plan that details current problems, the efforts undertaken to resolve or reduce the adverse impact of the problems, and resources needed to sustain the effort, thereby addressing the illegal drug and violence in their communities. At a minimum, the plan must be developed with a cooperative, collaborative, Multi-

disciplined approach. Participants must include agencies that represent law enforcement, prosecution, and probation.

The chart described below represents the OCJP resources that have been allocated for the Byrne Formula Block Grant Program:

Source: Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Anti-Drug Abuse Branch

STATE RESOURCES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM		
Position	Number of FTE Employees Working on the BJA Formula Grant Program*	Number of FTE Employees Funded by BJA Formula Grant Administrative Funds**
Staff Agency Head	1	0
Program Director/Manager	1	.75
Program Specialists	9	3.75
Fiscal Staff	7	1
Secretarial Staff	3	2

*Represents line staff, including program specialists, branch clerical, and their working level supervisors. These staff are responsible for the day-to-day management of the Byrne Formula Block Grant Program.

**Represents support staff that provide critical services in the areas of accounting, document control-central files, fiscal program compliance, and project monitoring and evaluation.

CALIFORNIA CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM OVERVIEW

In order to understand California's method for addressing the Multi-year statewide strategy and the problems it seeks to confront, it is necessary to understand the immense size and diversity of the State and its criminal justice system. California has one-eighth of the nation's population, which, as of January 1, 1996, was 32,231,000. By comparison, New York State has an approximate population of 18,000,000. California's population is dispersed within several large counties, e.g., Bay-area cities, central valley, southern, and border locations, whose population density exceeds 1,000,000 residents or more. Population growth is expected to increase at an estimated rate of 20% per year, up to the year 2000.

Between 1970-1996, population density has increased over 1,000% (percent), from 19 to 207 people per square mile (*Source: California Demographics, 1996*). It is important to note that California's fifty-eight counties encompass both metropolitan, suburban, urban, as well as rural areas. However, over 92% of California's population resides in urban areas.

California's criminal justice system is also large and diverse. Consider, for example, the number of law enforcement agencies throughout the State. There are:

- 25 State agencies with over 9,500 sworn officers/agents;
- 344 Police and Public Safety Departments;
- 58 County Sheriff's Departments;
- 9 County Marshal's Departments;
- 46 other departments in the Peace Officer Standards and Training Program (POST), e.g., transit, railroad, airport, coroner, park police departments, and
- 50 or more University/college campus, and community college police departments.

Each of the fifty-eight counties has an elected district attorney and, in most counties, a public defender. In counties not having Public Defender Offices, indigent defense services are provided either by private attorneys appointed or contracted by the court, or the Legal Aid Society.

The court system in California is comprised of a Supreme Court and six associate justices; six appellate districts, each with at least one division; fifty-eight superior courts, which include family court, some of which have multiple locations within larger counties, e.g., Los Angeles County Superior Court has 23 locations. There are 109 municipal courts, with 171 commissioners and referees.

At the State level, there are five major criminal justice agencies, departments, or commissions, including OCJP, that provide separate and distinct services statewide. Under the Youth and Correctional Agency (YACA), the California Department of Corrections (CDC) and the California Youth Authority (CYA) manages the State's adult and youth institutions. This responsibility extends to re-entry centers, camps, boot camps, community correctional facilities, residential drug treatment programs, and parole offices. CDC's prison population for all institutions is 142,000 inmates, which has increased 8% (10,488 inmates) since 1994. For CYA, 9,800 wards and inmates were housed in institutions, which represents 146.2% beyond design capacity for 6,402 inmates for institutions and camps combined.

Another major agency within the California criminal justice system is the State Attorney General's Office, the State's chief law enforcement officer, which includes California's Department of Justice. The Attorney General is responsible for ensuring that state laws are uniformly and adequately enforced. In this office, the Attorney General carries the constitutional responsibility through the programs of the Department of Justice. To support California's local law enforcement community, the Attorney General coordinates statewide narcotics enforcement efforts, participates in criminal investigations, and provides identification, information services, and telecommunications support. These activities are carried out through the Attorney General's Division of Law Enforcement. This division is comprised of six major bureaus that include investigation, forensic services, narcotic enforcement, criminal identification, criminal information and analysis, and the Western States Information Network (WSIN).

The next major law enforcement agency is the California Highway Patrol, whose primary mission is the management and regulation of traffic to achieve safe, lawful, and efficient use of the highway transportation system. As a secondary mission, the CHP, in its role as a major statewide law enforcement agency, supports local law enforcement and has consistently proven capable of assisting in emergencies that exceed local capabilities. Additionally, as a public service agency, the CHP provides disaster and life-saving assistance.

The California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ)

To further describe California's criminal justice system, it is necessary that we discuss the system's primary advisory board. The CCCJ was created through Legislative authority and codified in the California Penal Code Sections 13810-13813. The CCCJ is the primary advisory board to the Governor and the Legislature on criminal justice issues and policies and is composed of 37 members. CCCJ membership includes:

- Commissioner of the Highway Patrol;
- Director of the Department of Corrections;
- Director of the Department of the Youth Authority;

State Public Defender;
Nineteen members appointed by the Governor;
Eight members appointed by the Senate Rules Committee;
Eight members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly; and the
California Attorney General and the Administrative Director of the Courts, appointed by
State Statute

Members appointed by the Governor represent a wide array of professions representative of state government, county and city units of government, criminal justice, and communities. These gubernatorial appointees include county district attorneys and sheriffs, county public defenders and probation officers, city council members, a member of county boards of supervisors, and faculty members of colleges/universities. Appointees also include representation from the field of criminal justice research, and no less than six representatives from the general public, professional, or community-based organizations.

Likewise, Senate Rules Committee appointees include representation from the Senate Judiciary Committee, local government representation, e.g., city and county, a judge designated by the Judicial Council, and four private citizens, including a representative from the general public, professional, or community-based organizations.

Appointees of the Speaker of the Assembly include comparable representation of county and city officials and private citizens representing various organizations. Included within this assemblage is a member of the Assembly committee on Criminal Justice, a chief of police, a peace officer, and representation of community organization directly related to delinquency prevention. By Legislative authority, the Council Executive Secretary is the Executive Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP). The Council Executive Secretary provides the staff necessary to keep all records, agendas, minutes, approves all Council expenditures, and provides any additional staff necessary to plan, organize, coordinate, and direct Council activities.

The goals of the CCCJ include:

- Identification of current and future issues involving the administration of justice;
- Development of recommendations concerning criminal identification, apprehension, prosecution, incarceration, and reintegration into society;
- Analysis of criminal justice legislation;
- Assistance to criminal justice and law enforcement agencies in the development and effective use of resources; and
- Coordination of studies and recommendations with other advisory boards in the state on issues common to adult and juvenile justice.

STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND COORDINATION ISSUES

Upon receipt of guidance from BJA concerning the requirements for developing a Multi-year program strategy, OCJP began an assessment of the kinds of changes that may be required. Prior to the current program requirement, OCJP has addressed the strategy development process and coordination issues through pre-existing forums, legislatively authorized policy boards and committees. However, difficulties surfaced in developing immediate access to professionals, governmental officials, and planning forums, who may have had interest in the design of the multi-year statewide strategy. Our next immediate concern was to determine how different California's multi-year strategic planning approach would be, in comparison to the current concept.

These concerns were borne out of understanding the nature of the Byrne Block Grant Program and its intent, the new strategy submission format, and the new program planning opportunities that would be presented as a result.

California's strategy submissions have continuously and uniformly been aligned with the goals of the National Drug Control Policy. Equally important is that previously submitted strategies discussed our perspective and shared viewpoints of continuing immediate program efforts for the upcoming year. A concerted effort is now being undertaken to visualize and execute an ambitious approach for future multi-year planning and program implementation, to evolve year-by-year into a comprehensive plan for this important program. The discussion that follows will provide current and planned activities that will allow California to adapt to the multi-year Strategy. This narrative will discuss anticipated planning difficulties and some of the alternatives that may be undertaken within the first and possibly subsequent years, to resolve those difficulties. Within the framework of the multi-year program updates, currently required in the new format, further discussion will be presented to describe whether or not the alternatives previously given were successful and how inventive alternatives were implemented in future submissions.

Coordination Among Criminal Justice Systems Agencies

Among the strongest supporters of the Byrne Formula Block Grant Program are agencies that represent California's criminal justice system. Due to the immense size and diverse agency missions, coordination at the strategy development level with every agency was complex and formidable.

The cornerstone of any coordination effort is arriving at consensus for proposed efforts. This fact will hold true for the upcoming multi-year phase of the program. Due to the timing of this new format, forums that have been established by legislative authority and key policy makers, have already convened. However, within the coming months, other planning forums and key statewide events will convene and valuable input for strategy improvements will be solicited. In the interim, California's submission will have been reviewed at several levels of state and local authority, which conforms to the intent of the strategy development process. Any recommended changes that were a result of this review have been incorporated within the context of this submission.

One of the most important collaborative efforts that will be undertaken in the future includes the State Public Safety Conference, that will convene on April, 8-10, 1997. The theme of this conference is: "*Partnering to Keep California Safer.*" The Office of Criminal Justice Planning, in coordination with the Public Safety Directors' Group, is sponsoring this conference. It is the mission of the **State Public Safety Directors' Group** to ensure that state departments, agencies, and the Attorney General's Office effectively plan and coordinate public safety efforts, programs, and funding for the Governor, so that the State of California can become safer for its citizens. Some of the global goals of the Group includes the following:

- Report to the Governor on progress, accomplishments, and new initiatives;
- Develop committees that will assist in coordination and planning efforts;
- Provide a platform for other agencies and organizations associated with public safety to discuss public safety issues and concerns; and
- Develop California strategies for crime prevention and public safety.

This group is also the key advisory group designated to set policy and priorities for the Statewide Multi-year Strategy. The membership list, including agency and level of government is included in the appendix. The State Public Safety Director's Group and conference is being used as a catalyst for developing a statewide plan for the improvement of criminal justice and juvenile delinquency. The State Public Safety Director's Group includes membership and representation from the following agencies:

Office of Criminal Justice Planning*
California Department of Justice
California Department of Corrections
California Youth Authority
Health and Welfare Data Center
Department of Motor Vehicles
Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control

Governor's Liaison for Law Enforcement
State Military Department
Office of Emergency Service
California Highway Patrol
State Fire Marshal
Police Officer Standards and Training

(* Executive Director-Chair)

Under this setting, the conference will provide public safety officials with an opportunity to discuss relevant policy issues and learn about innovative ideas to continue providing a safe environment for the people of the State of California. Ideally, this forum will also be used to solicit discussion and reach consensus on issues that affect the state's interpretation and response to illegal drug use, manufacturing, trafficking, and violent crime problems, as it relates to the current program priorities discussed in the narrative of this strategy. The Public Safety Director's Group will be discussed in greater detail in the *Public, Legislative, and Executive Agency Review* section.

OCJP continues to participate in the exchange of information between all major criminal justice systems agencies. In soliciting future input for strategy improvements, recommending service delivery activities within specific program settings, and long-term, comprehensive planning actions, consulting with key decision makers within these agencies becomes essential. For the purposes of strategy development and statewide priority setting, the **California Public Safety Directors' Group** will be the advisory board used to coordinate future strategy development activities between various groups with which coordination is required. This means that, all major criminal justice agencies are active members and participate regularly on the California Public Safety Director's Group. Common and unique criminal justice interests are served at this level, which may drive the revision, issue identification, and program input consideration of the Byrne Block Grant Program and other equally important federally funded criminal justice programs.

Coordination between State/Local and Federal Law Enforcement Agencies

Coordination between federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies in previous years have been highly participative and structured toward the effective use of federal funding for drug control and violent crime reduction. On a routine basis, state and local criminal justice agencies collaborate with federal agencies during ongoing law enforcement operations. For example, under drug control programs funded under the Byrne Block Grant Program, federal agencies such as the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), United States Forestry Service (USFS), and DOJ's Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement provide either funding or field operations support assistance for continuing activities under the **Marijuana Suppression Program**. During previous years, federal criminal justice agencies provided support under the **Campaign Against Marijuana Planting (CAMP) Program** and the **Cannabis Eradication**

Program (CEP). Strong relationships were developed between these agencies, that previously employed the largest task force in the United States, to interdict marijuana production and distribution.

With the advent of the multiyear strategy, California now seeks to look beyond these traditional day-to-day relationships between federal, state, and local agencies. This new requirement may provide opportunities for planners and decision makers to exploit the experiences and expertise of federal agencies in connecting federally driven programs to local needs and National Drug Control Priorities. Local steering committees have extended invitations to federal criminal justice agency representatives to participate in local planning discussions and information exchange forums within participating counties. Selected federal agency representatives have provided training to local agencies on topics that include officer safety, financial investigation, surveillance and tactical operations techniques, and task force planning and operations. The majority of program participants have recognized earlier that these federal agencies are an essential resource for information, contingency planning, and strengthening existing program activities. A secondary benefit, but equally important is that this relationship supports the effective use of federal, state, and local resources aimed at combating illegal drugs and violent crime.

California remains optimistic regarding the continuing role federal criminal justice agencies will have in addressing drug control and violent crime problems statewide. U.S. Customs regional offices have asked to be included in future planning and coordination activities. Currently, this federal agency has been underutilized as a federal criminal justice agency resource. The information this agency has provided regarding drug threat levels, trafficking trends, and California-Mexico border issues, have already proved invaluable. Due to diminishing staff and continuing commitments for border reinforcement, agents assigned to these regions are not permanently positioned on local task forces. However, their expertise in illegal immigrant activities, and in identifying drug trafficking corridors originating from Mexico, has substantially supported drug interdiction efforts for Imperial and San Diego counties. Plans are continuing to include representatives of the U.S. Border Patrol in all planning efforts pertaining to the Byrne Block Grant Program and other pertinent state and locally funded law enforcement efforts.

California currently complies with a federal reporting requirement that affects Byrne funding, concerning notice and provision of records to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). Reporting requirements are satisfied through the *California Plan*. This plan, developed by OCJP, complies with federal law that requires that criminal justice agencies notify INS upon conviction of an individual suspected of being an illegal alien. California requires all law enforcement booking agencies to immediately contact the nearest INS office and to document arrest and court dispositions if the detained person is suspected of being an illegal alien. During the multiyear strategy, this plan should not be affected. The one limitation that may affect this program is the speed in which U.S. Customs accepts custody of illegal immigrants after arrest and court dispositions are made. The lack of speed in this particular area has been hampered by the number of agents that are available to respond to counties to secure the custody of the illegal alien. Even so, given this constraint, U.S. Customs agents have made this response a priority.

Coordination Among Federally Funded Programs

The affect of the multiyear strategy development process provided an interesting glimpse at future program development opportunities. Currently, various state agencies receive federal funding to support ongoing violence, delinquency prevention, drug treatment, and education programs. OCJP, in its capacity as the SAA, provides oversight for a select number of these

programs. Other key state agencies that exercise oversight authority for some of these programs include, but are not limited to:

The Department of Health and Welfare Agency

Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP): Under the Health and Welfare Agency, this state agency is the designated Single State Agency (SSA) responsible for administering, coordinating, and providing interagency coordination of the State's efforts in alcohol and drug abuse prevention, treatment, and recovery services. The Health and Welfare Agency also includes the Departments of Health Services, Mental Health, Rehabilitation, and Social Services, Aging, and others. In partnership with county governments and in cooperation with numerous private and public agencies, organizations, and groups, this agency provides leadership and coordination in planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive statewide alcohol and drug use prevention, intervention, detoxification, treatment and recovery systems. These responsibilities fall within ADP's objective setting of maximizing financing of prevention, treatment, and recovery programs in California while ensuring quality, minimizing the infringement of bureaucracy, and documenting successes.

Collaborative and mutually supporting activities between ADP, the California Department of Education (CDE), and OCJP, have been sustained through interagency agreements for two key programs administered by OCJP. These major state agencies continue to maintain linkages that integrate alcohol and other drugs (AOD) services within a comprehensive network of community, education, social, health, mental health, criminal justice, and other public and private sector agencies and organizations. An example of this comprehensive approach is found in the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) and Suppression of Drug Abuse in the Schools Programs.

Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program (DARE): This program provides classroom instruction by uniformed officers and recruits positive student leaders to influence younger students; kindergarten through sixth grades, not to use alcohol and other drugs. Through an interagency agreement between ADP and OCJP (Gang Violence Suppression Branch), funding is provided to local educational agencies who currently serve kindergarten through third grade students and fourth through sixth grade students with the DARE-like curriculum. Additionally, parents of the students served are also reached through activities offered under the DARE program, as well as student leaders that are used to provide positive peer involvement in related activities.

As a result of changes in federal legislation, the federal Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act no longer mandates a separate DARE. Program. Instead, legislation now requires "law enforcement education partnerships" working in concert for the purpose of carrying out drug abuse and violence prevention activities. Some examples are: use of Drug Abuse Resistance Education and other curricula that provide classroom instruction by uniformed law enforcement officers and designed to teach students to recognize and resist pressures to use drugs; classroom instruction on the law and legal system; partnerships between law enforcement and child guidance professionals; and before and after school activities. The current Drug Suppression in Schools Program (DSP) will allow for these programmatic additions and the six components of DSP will be expanded to include examples given in the federal legislation.

Suppression of Drug Abuse in the Schools Program: This program, administered through OCJP's Gang Violence Suppression Branch, is also included in the interagency agreement between ADP, CDE, and OCJP to provide financial and technical assistance to law enforcement agencies and school districts, to reduce drug abuse and drug trafficking in and around schools. The program's aim is to restore safety to the schools and playgrounds, assuring a safe and drug-free environment where teachers teach and children learn.

The focal point where active coordination of the multi-year strategy development process occurs will be the Public Safety Directors' Group, which is comprised of representatives from major criminal justice agencies and statewide provider organizations. Currently, ADP is not represented under other convening criminal justice advisory boards. However, the majority of the directors of these agencies also participate on other state advisory boards, such as the California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ), the Directors' Advisory Council (DAC), and the State Public Directors' Group, continuity is assured by disseminating issues pertaining to drugs and violent crime, to the administering agency. A plan of action for coordinating future strategy development activities will be limited only by the frequency that these advisory board meetings are scheduled. The ADP director will be invited to attend to provide input concerning how strategy development can address alcohol and other drug problems. Consistency will be maintained through published agenda items that will identify issues of concern and how those issues are resolved. These forums will also be used to determine whether program strategies or their priorities should change be modified to embrace the issues and the resolutions that were discussed during these forums.

During the first year of the multiyear strategy, new approaches will be developed to determine where program gaps and redundancies occur, if any. Thorough preparation for these advisory board meetings will minimize any problematic concerns regarding differences in program funding criteria, compared to the manner in which ADP, CDE, and OCJP funded programs are structured.

Currently, there are assurances made through interagency agreements between these major program agencies, along with published program guidelines that program redundancies are minimal. Prior to the submission of any strategy updates, participating federally funded agencies will be solicited for information concerning any modifications of program content to determine whether these recommended program changes were sustained and incorporated into the fabric of the strategy updates. For this reason, the structure and form of this submission is designed around flexibility to adjust to the kinds of recommendations that may be provided by participating federal agencies, e.g., U. S. Border Patrol, Housing and Urban Development (HUD), etc. It is our intent to have future strategy submissions mirror the diversity of agencies providing local support beyond and parallel to the Byrne Memorial Block Grant Program.

The following is a listing of the most significant ADP programs that are federally funded under the Federal Trust Fund* .

STATE PROGRAM	PURPOSE	FEDERAL SOURCE
Substance Abuse Prevention & Treatment (SAPT) Block Grant	Funds are used for an array of activities to prevent and treat substance abuse that includes alcohol, illicit and licit drugs, and use or abuse of tobacco products.	Federal Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration (SAMSHA) Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT)
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program	ADP's share of the SDFSC funding used to support goals and objectives specific to the drug and violence prevention activities, to include programming and coordination for this program.	U.S. Department of Education (Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, title IV, Part A, Subpart I)
Criminal Justice Target Cities	Funds are used to improve substance abuse treatment systems, through cooperative agreements between ADP and targeted cities. Targeted cities currently include Los Angeles and San Francisco.	Federal Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration Center for Substance Abuse Treatment
Critical Populations Program Grant	Funds are used to expand the availability of high quality treatment services for individuals with alcohol and drug problems for desired critical populations statewide.	Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT)

*The programs listed above does not reflect the total number of programs funded under the Federal Trust Fund. Other federally funded programs administered by ADP include:

- Criminal Justice Incarcerated and Non-incarcerated Program;
- Pregnant and Postpartum Women's Program;
- Women and their Children Program;
- HIV-AIDS/TB Outreach;
- Criminal Justice Treatment Network;
- Uniform Data Systems; and
- Prevention Needs Assessment.

The single point of contact for federal and state funding and programs administered by ADP is as follows:

Michael Schauffle, Budget Officer
Division of Administration
Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs
1700 K Street, Fifth Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 322-6829

California Department of Education

The U.S. Department of Education provides federal funds to CDE, who works cooperatively with ADP, under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Under this program, the **School Safety and Violence Prevention Office** administers and provides programmatic and fiscal oversight for the following federally funded programs:

PROGRAM	PURPOSE	CONTACT POINT
School Violence Reduction Program	Implement a variety of safe schools strategies based on local needs	Karen Lowry, Education Consultant (916) 323-1027
Targeted Truancy and Public Safety Grant Program	To implement integrated interventions to prevent repeated truant and related behaviors.	Eloise Bradrick-Talk (916) 324-6159
School Community Violence Prevention Grant Program	To address local communities' own unique needs related to non-violence strategies.	Olin Jones, Attorney General's Office (916) 324-7863 and Eloise Bradrick-Talk (CDE)
Conflict Resolution & Youth Mediation	To provide training to feeder school teams in conflict resolution.	Steve Jeffries, Attorney General's Office (916) 324-7863 and Karen Lowry (CDE)
Safe School Plan Implementation	To assist schools in implementing a portion of their Safe School Plan	Vivian Linfor, Education Program Asst. (916) 323-1026
Gang Risk Intervention Program (GRIP)	To intervene and prevent gang violence	Chuck Nichols , Education Consultant (916) 323-1026

Source: California Department of Education, School Safety and Violence Prevention Office

Safe and Drug -Free Schools and Communities Act, Title IV, Improving America's School Act of 1994: These programs provide funding and technical assistance for local school and community-based alcohol and other drug education and prevention programs. Authorized strategies and expenditures, included mentoring, comprehensive health education, conflict resolution and youth mediation programs, community service, hate-motivated violence prevention, coordinated family service delivery models, and school security personnel. CDE supports this new federal focus through strong collaboration between the Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office and the Healthy Kids Program Office. For further information concerning this administrative office and programs, contact:

Mary Tobias Weaver, Program Administrator
California Department of Education
Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office
560 J Street, Suite #260
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 324-323-2183
FAX: (916) 343-6061

Other Non-Byrne-funded Block Grant Programs

Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program (LLEBG): In 1996, OCJP was designated the SAA for the federally funded Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (LLEBG), whose purpose is to reduce crime and improving public safety. These federal funds were authorized under the Omnibus Fiscal Year 1996 Appropriations Act , which provided \$503 million nationwide to units of local government under this program. Of this amount, California received a total of \$72,099,876, of which \$71,559,231 was directly awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, to units of government whose award

amounts were at least \$10,000 (specifically 325 cities and 51 counties in California). Funding amounts were based on the local jurisdictions' average annual number of Part I violent crimes, e.g., murder, aggravated assault, robbery, and forcible rape, compared to all other local jurisdictions in the state for 1992 through 1994.

In August, 1996 an Ad Hoc Working Group met to discuss the utilization of funds awarded to the State of California. After presentation from the Department of Justice, the working group achieved consensus for the use of the state award. In order of priority, the working group agreed to the following:

- Fund Cal Gang (Information System) to complete the infrastructure so that users can access data using "web browser";
- Provide funds to local units of government to purchase technology to permit use of the Cal Gang System;
- Fund a pilot program to address juvenile crime using LiveScan technology; and
- Fund a restorative justice mediation program.

The unique aspect of the LLEBG Program reinforces Byrne Formula-funded program activities currently underway and managed by the Department of Justice. Program oversight is maintained by the Anti-Drug Abuse Branch, who manages the Byrne Block Grant Program, under the Criminal Justice System Improvement component.

Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Public Housing Drug Elimination Block Grant Program (PHDEP): California currently receives federal funding under this program for 23 project locations throughout the state. The PHDEP funds selected locations within California for use in eliminating drug-related crime and criminal activities associated with drug-related problems "in or around" public housing and Native American housing developments.

One of the most significant program requirements participants must adhere to is that the project must be a part of a comprehensive drug elimination plan. This plan must address the elimination of drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in or around public and Native American housing complexes.

Field offices located in Los Angeles (southern region), San Francisco (bay cities/coastal region), and Sacramento (northern/rural region) are currently establishing more visibility and collaborative linkages with local agencies and OCJP. These linkages are expected to yield a solid foundation for providing a substantial level of strategy development input in the future. This is due to the unique nature of the geographical, crime, and drug related setting of public housing. Field Directors from these offices have expressed interest and have been invited to attend and participate in future Byrne-funded strategy and program development activities.

For further information concerning this program, please contact the following field offices:

HUD Los Angeles Area Office

Beverly Kendrick, Director
Office of Public Housing
or
Michael Kulick, Director

HUD California State Office

Joyce M. Roberson, Director
Office of Public Housing
or
Keith Axtell, Director

Office of Housing
U.S. Department of Housing &
Urban Development (HUD)
Los Angeles Area Office
1615 West Olympic Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90015-3801
Phone: (213) 251-7095
FAX: (213) 251-7096

Office of Housing
U.S. Department of Housing &
Urban Development (HUD)
Pacific/Hawaii Office
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3448
Phone: (415) 436-6466
FAX: (415) 436-6510

HUD Sacramento Office

William E. Armstead, Director
Office of Public Housing
or
William F. Bolton, Director
Multifamily Housing Division
U.S. Housing & Urban Development (HUD)
777 - 12th Street, Suite #200
Sacramento, CA 95814-1997
Phone: (916) 498-5220, Ext. 421
FAX: (916) 498-5262

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program: OCJP, as the SAA, takes its direction on juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues from the JJDP State Advisory Group (SAG). The JJDP Act requires the establishment of the SAG, whose members are appointed by the Governor. The SAG participates in the development and review of the state plan, reviews, and makes funding recommendations on juvenile justice and delinquency prevention grant applications, provides advice to OCJP on juvenile justice issues, and reviews progress and accomplishments of projects funded under the state plan. As such, strategy development coordination is maintained at the JJDP branch level, with input and program development recommendations being articulated from the SAG to OCJP, for consideration and possibly, strategy revision, subject to the Public Safety Director's Group approval.

Federal funds are received under three separate and distinct program headings, that include: (1 Title II - Formula Grant Program, (2 Title II - Challenge Activities Program, and (3 Local Incentive Grants Program.

Title II - Formula Grant Program: These funds are used for collaborative community projects that emphasize youth accountability and parental involvement through education, training, diversion, victim restitution, treatment, rehabilitation, and delinquency prevention.

Title II - Challenge Activities Program: These funds provide incentives for states participating in the Formula Grants Program to develop, adopt, and improve policies and programs in specified challenge activities. The challenge activities that have been adopted by California are:

- Challenge "C": to increase community-based alternatives to incarceration;
- Challenge "E": to develop and adopt policies to prohibit gender bias in placement and treatment centers and establish programs to ensure female youth have access to the full range of social services; and
- Challenge "I": to increase aftercare services for juveniles involved in the justice system.

Title V - Local Incentive Grants Program: This program was added to the JJDP Act in 1992. Under this program, federal funds must be used to develop a comprehensive multiyear plan which periodically assesses and prioritizes risk factors/needs in the community. The risk factors are associated with the development of delinquent behavior. Project implement strategies tailored to address the prioritized risk factors and to protect children from their effects. The efforts of these projects must represent a collaborative effort by a dedicated community coalition of citizens, private businesses, and public agencies. For further information concerning these federally funded programs, please contact the following:

Kathryn Garcelon, Senior Program Specialist
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Branch
1130 K Street, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-7734

Coordination with Relevant Representatives of the Public

In order to determine the focus and priorities of the multiyear strategy, OCJP convened Public Meetings at strategic localities throughout California. The advance notice was sent to state and local governments, community-based agencies, and interested local leaders, and community residents. The format of these meetings were changed in hopes of encouraging a focus on new approaches that would address the statewide drug and violent crime problem. Prospective participants were asked to be prepared to discuss community needs that would enable the Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program to expand beyond the 11 federally approved program purpose areas, which have been converted into 15 program title areas. Added emphasis was placed on predetermined discussions concerning program expansion and that any such expansion must be responsive to the needs of communities throughout California. This announcement also placed prospective participants on notice that they will be solicited for input on the future design characteristics of the ADA Program. Persons unable to attend were provided with an opportunity to submit written comments concerning program improvement and expansion.

Instead of panelists being selected to monitor and respond to issues raised by the audience, the public meetings were facilitated by OCJP management. The executive director, deputy director of programs, and the ADA branch chief solicited responses concerning issues involving community needs, program expansion ideas, and new approaches to address the statewide drug and violent crime problem.

What ensued as a result of these public meetings is a compilation of recommendations, a general consensus of future program structure and content, along with strong commitments to support national drug control priorities. The following represents a summary of recommendations, that includes verbal and written comments made during the public meetings. Some of the recommendations made were considered during the strategy development process.

Federal Program Purpose Areas

Participants recommended that select program purposes should be incorporated/integrated into 2-3 general program areas and tailored to a specific jurisdiction.

Further discussions by participants indicated a perception that Byrne funding used for suppression activities won't make the problem go away. Instead, local dollars should be

used for effective domestic violence prosecution. By doing so, this approach may have a positive effect on youth and drug abuse.

Some participants asked that federal funding not be withdrawn from law enforcement and other relevant programs. The most effective approach is to use the funding for enforcement activities.

Multiyear Plan

The majority of public meeting participants strongly supported the multiyear strategy approach. The basis of this support was evident among a few counties who indicated there is a lack of planning continuity regarding anti-drug efforts. Some of the participants however asked that planners take care in assuring that the “process” should not be more expensive or cumbersome than the funding for a three year plan itself. Participants must take into account the need for counties to budget on a yearly basis.

48-Month Rule

Some of the participants asked that OCJP consider a waiver of the 48-month rule for non-task force related programs and activities. It is becoming progressively more difficult for smaller counties to change program strategies and still be expected to be effective.

Funding Allocations

There was consensus among the participants that federal funds should not be used for education and treatment. There was agreement that education and treatment is needed; but not without enforcement.

Representatives from smaller rural counties indicated that without federal funds (Byrne Block Grant), the local economy cannot mount any kind of concerted anti-drug enforcement activities. A recommendation was made to keep the baseline of \$150,000 constant or increase this amount, if possible.

Some rural counties recommended that if the base amount formula is revised, consider the use of “illegal drug production” as a variable, instead of the crime index, which is the current method.

Program Structure

Steering Committees: Added emphasis must be placed in the use of treatment, education, and enforcement within the current multi-component framework of the ADA Program. The steering committee should be the single forum by which subordinate disciplines should be included. Counties have tried to encourage other professionals to help in the planning process, but incentives to participate is lacking.

OCJP’s requirement to establish a steering committee is a good step forward, as it forces participants to produce. Required time lines helps the process, as most committee members have strong issues/arguments and the time line helps keep participants moving toward solutions.

Program Flexibility: At present, the program strategies are too restrictive and individual counties can't implement unique programs. Allow counties to develop their own strategies or modify existing strategies to best suit the needs of the county. Communities should be given more freedom to develop unique programs to satisfy local needs. The reapplication process creates micromanagement of local efforts. Block grants are the best approach, as it gives local government freedom to devise methods and strategies best suited to combat local crime.

Rewards/Incentives: Representatives from most participating counties indicated that incentives or rewards should be provided to counties that are doing well.

General Program Concerns

The following issues and concerns were expressed by participants attending the Public Meetings:

- Clandestine/Methamphetamine Laboratories are becoming an increasing problem. Consider direct funding to allow law enforcement to deal more effectively with clan lab cleanup. Funds should be made available to subsidize a multi-jurisdictional project to hit the problem statewide. This comment was echoed by marijuana producing counties, e.g., Humboldt, Mendocino, and Trinity, concerning the growing marijuana problem.
- Drug Courts: Large to medium sized counties indicated that program funding should be expanded. A recommendation was made to use a base amount or set-aside to establish drug courts in each county. Continue current funding so that existing programs don't end.
- High Technology Crime: Provide funds to target high-tech crimes statewide. Intelligence information confirms that these activities are often tied inalterably to drug production, trafficking, and use.
- Technology Upgrades: Most automated equipment purchased through this federal program requires replacement. Technology is moving faster, thus upgrades are needed. Recommend a one time allocation expressly for upgrading automation in support of future program activities.

NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

Data Sources for the Problem Statement

Data contained in this strategy submission was derived from a myriad of sources throughout the state. As the problem settings tend to migrate throughout the state, so does the varying sources of information. Crime trend discussions were regionalized, based on the seven Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement Task Force regions. Necessary variations in the depth of this data occurred due to separate reporting requirements of these data sources, compared to OCJP specific reporting requirements for Byrne-funded projects located throughout the state. Advantages were derived through these differences, as notable crime trends and tendencies, narcotic threat levels, and resulting interdiction efforts often emerge as a result. Redundancy in reporting is minimized due to separate reporting standards between agencies.

Other participating federal, state, and local agencies that provided crime and illegal drug data included the following:

- Western States Intelligence Network (WSIN): drug price/purity (statewide trends) summaries, drug intelligence information, trafficking patterns and related trends;
- California's Department of Justice, bureau of Narcotics Enforcement (Law Enforcement division): leading illegal drug prevalence, including clandestine laboratory dismantling efforts, and methamphetamine production, marijuana, cocaine, and heroin sales and trafficking;
- U.S. Border Patrol: Drug intelligence activity at ports of entry, transshipment trends, intrastate movement and trafficking corridors, known illegal immigrant and criminal organizations operating near southern border locations;
- Byrne-funded projects assigned to multi-jurisdictional task forces and special law enforcement activities; and
- Other public and private information and data gathering resources that include: the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Criminal Justice Division, the Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System (SWBSADIS), and other pertinent criminal justice resources throughout the state.

During the development of the Statewide Strategy, a few difficulties were experienced in obtaining accurate, reliable data that was specific to supporting the elements contained in the problem statement. Should limitations be indicated, a brief discussion concerning any perceived implications will be made throughout the discussion within the problem statement.

Criminal Justice Records Improvement Update

California Department of Justice (DOJ)

Statewide Integrated Narcotics System (SINS)

Criminal History Record Improvement System (CHRIS)

Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System (SWBSADIS)

OCJP has provided Byrne funds to state and local criminal justice agencies to automate their criminal history information, intelligence data, automated fingerprint transfers, and improve the information collected for criminal histories. In summary, the objectives of this program are to:

- Develop timelines for the improvement of state identification and information systems;
- Implement and provide criminal intelligence information and criminal history records to local law enforcement, that will also accommodate local search and storage needs, eliminating the need to upgrade local systems; and
- Provide investigative support through product development and improvement.

During 1996, the agencies listed above, the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Identification and Information (BCII) in collaboration with OCJP, sponsored meetings with law enforcement on Full Use Access Agency (FUAA) and Local Input Terminal (LIT) development. These meetings were scheduled to solicit valuable input from end users on the methods of transmitting information through the system.

California's Long Range Plan (LRP), with program oversight maintained by BCII, continues to evolve. This LRP has been developed to ensure that California's criminal justice records will continue to improve in the level of accuracy and completeness, as required by funding criteria under the Byrne Memorial Block Grant Program. The records improvement feature will enable local agencies to transmit valid data to BCII for processing and fingerprint identification inquiries. OCJP, along with BCII's Criminal History Processor staff, have worked jointly on tape input format analysis, modeling, and data dictionary development. The latter, reported in the most recent Annual Report, has undergone inadvertent delays due to the advancement of technology within a short period of time. However, work and component specifications have been completed and a vendor contract detailing these requirements is currently being processed.

Recently, BCII redesigned the Automated Criminal History System, a component part of CHRIS, so it could be more adaptable to increasing demands for information carried on the system. This redesign will also have the capacity to automatically interface with an increasing number of systems outside the DOJ network. Such as system may be found in the Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System (SWBSADIS). An additional benefit of this project is the reduction in overhead costs and will, over time, eliminate duplication of effort between BCII and local agencies. Information will be maintained in the central repository, with a capability of generating a computer readable record that is distributed to participating counties.

Due to increasing advancement of information systems technology, the LiveSCAN component of the system is being updated. Some difficulties have been encountered with local vendors providing hardware for local sites, which has delayed full implementation of the LiveSCAN feature of the system. BCII and OCJP are working closely to resolve this short-term condition.

Analysis of Drug and Crime Problems and Trends

Region I

Region 1 consists of the northern rural counties of Siskiyou, Modoc, Trinity Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Plumas, Glenn, Butte, Sierra, Nevada, Yuba, Placer, Colusa, Sutter, Yolo, and the following central counties of Sacramento, El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Alpine, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Mono. These counties (except for Sacramento) are primarily rural and sparsely populated with moderate to small population centers.

Siskiyou, Trinity, Shasta and Placer counties receive funding for Anti-Drug Abuse and Marijuana Suppression efforts.

The topographical and climatic features of some of the northern counties, with large tracts of privately and publicly owned timberland, virtually inaccessible terrain, remote mountainous areas, almost unlimited water supplied by year-round springs for irrigation, acres of vineyards, and nutrient-rich soil, encourage marijuana cultivation. In order to avoid detection many growers cultivate their gardens on land that they do not own, such as commercial and public timberlands and vineyards. This type of situation makes it nearly impossible for law enforcement to successfully identify the growers.

Sonoma County, the entrance to the "Emerald Triangle", reported they had no marijuana-related violence between the early 1980s to September 1995. In September 1995, there were three incidents of violence reported, all of which were directly related to the cultivation of marijuana. All three incidents included victims shot as a result of being within the proximity of, or discovering, marijuana garden sites.

Trinity County also reports an increase in their major crimes. They have associated the increase to marijuana growers using violence as a way to protect their marijuana. Trinity is the center of the infamous "Emerald Triangle" extremely well known for its potent "home grown" marijuana.

Placer County reports the prevalent drug of choice on Placer County school campuses continues to be marijuana with over 90% of the arrests being made for possession or sales. They also report that Placer County is a high income area that seems to lend itself to individuals with not only an interest in growing high quality marijuana, but also purchasing and distribution of better quality marijuana.

Through vigorous law enforcement and prosecution efforts, Shasta County has consistently eradicated a large number of plants and is always among the highest in the state for arrests and convictions. These vigorous efforts have resulted in a decrease in marijuana-related seizures and arrests over the past 10 years.

Most of the counties have reported that statistical analysis have indicated, while arrests have remained constant, they have experienced a decrease in outdoor grows and an increase in indoor grows.

Although marijuana is an entrenched problem in the northern counties of Region 1, the counties in central California have experienced methamphetamine as the current drug of choice for consumption and production. The drug is relatively easy to make and is highly addictive. Cocaine and heroin are also available, although rarely seized in large quantities. Opium has influence among the South East Asian population.

Trinity County reports that 75% of their drug offenders are also heavy alcohol abusers. The county probation department reports that 65% of active probation cases are narcotics or alcohol related.

Nevada County reports that approximately 85% of the criminal cases processed in their Municipal and Superior Courts are alcohol and drug-related. Defendants were either using or selling drugs, committed their offense while under the influence of a drug or alcohol, or committed the crime to maintain their drug or alcohol dependency.

Shasta County has attributed 75% of property crimes in their county, to drug-related incidents. A majority of the large seizures of methamphetamine and meth labs involve Mexican Nationals who are in the country illegally.

Region I, having several counties along the Nevada border, has experienced an increasing problem of drug transshipment along Highway 395 which has several long stretches of remote areas. Highway 395 connects Southern California with the Reno/Lake Tahoe area, and continues to the most northeastern part of California.

Sacramento County directly links their drug problem to street gangs. In an effort to maintain control over the manufacturing and supply of drugs, elements of the more sophisticated and violent Los Angeles based gangs have taken root in Sacramento. Gangs who traditionally manufactured and supplied rock cocaine exclusively, are now selling methamphetamine also in an attempt to broaden their economic base and extend their influence. Local gangs, in danger of being wiped out by their better organized and heavily armed counterparts from Southern California, are forming alliances with the various outside factions. The combined effect of having outside and local gangs competing for the control of the drug market in Sacramento has caused the deterioration of neighborhoods. Local gang members in Sacramento, involved in the drug trade, have been linked to investigations in Ohio, Colorado, Montana and Mexico. Local mid to major-level dealers are able to purchase kilogram quantities of cocaine at prices competitive with Los Angeles.

Unlike most other areas in Region I, the San Joaquin Valley area is host to a very large population of illegal aliens and migrant workers due to agriculture production. A high rate of poverty and unemployment has fostered the development of gangs among the youth population. There are 15,000 felony probationers and 1,770 state parolees in the county. Tar heroin and methamphetamine are imported by undocumented Mexican farm workers for later sales. They report large numbers of clandestine labs located in the rural areas of the county, in part because of the isolated nature of homes, farm property and limited law enforcement resources for these areas.

Region II

This area includes Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Marin, Lake, Napa, Solano, Contra Costa and Alameda counties. These counties (except for Alameda) can be generally categorized as small and/or rural due to populations and county size. The north to south direction of the 101 Highway provides a direct link between southern and northern parts of the state facilitating the transportation of narcotics through California to Oregon and Washington.

The counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino and Lake receive funding for Anti-Drug Abuse and Marijuana Suppression efforts. The northern section of the region contains areas that are major producers of high-potency marijuana that is ultimately transported, distributed and sold statewide and nationally. Grow sites continue to be smaller than in the past and generally not staffed full-time for maintenance or security. The trend has been towards shorter plant heights while at the same ensuring potency is not sacrificed. Indoor grows remain popular for their ability to shield production from law enforcement while producing quality plants.

Methamphetamine manufacturing continues, on a limited basis, in each county. However, detection is extremely difficult due to the small number of labs and the remoteness of some areas. Arrests for possession and possession for sale of methamphetamine exceed all other illegal drugs in the region. In addition, the close knit relationship among suppliers and buyers makes identification and infiltration difficult at best. Some counties have resorted to hiring individuals from outside the county to gain entrance into the drug culture for intelligence gathering purposes. This is a time consuming process, as they must gain the trust of both dealers and users which can take many months.

Due to its size, population and location, Alameda County contains perhaps the greatest mix of illegal narcotics than any other county in Region II. Anything that can be purchased in Los Angeles, San Diego or any other major metropolitan area can be found in Oakland and other neighboring cities. While not a major producer of narcotics, Alameda is positioned as a major distribution point for traffickers throughout the state.

Major state and local resources have been allocated for drug efforts in the region. Numerous narcotic operations have left little impact on the manufacturing and sales as evidenced by the fact that statistics reported seem to be holding fairly steady.

Region III

Region III covers the southern central coast and includes the counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Monterey, and the inland counties of Santa Clara and San Benito. This region is mostly coastal and somewhat mountainous. The counties of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz have moderate population density; while Santa Clara and San Mateo have high population density and San Francisco has excessively high population density.

The counties of Santa Cruz and Monterey receive funding for the Anti-Drug Abuse and Marijuana Suppression Program.

These areas are vulnerable to air, marine and ground transportation of illegal drugs and narcotics. Major highway systems that traverse these coastal areas have become the primary conduit for transportation of other illegal drugs such as methamphetamine and marijuana. Secondary to these highways, but no less significant are the major ports-of-call that have become major staging areas for the receipt and distribution of illegal drugs. For instance, Santa Cruz County has a vast, unprotected coastline that travels from the San Mateo County line to the Monterey County line. It has been rumored for years that marijuana smugglers have imported many tons of marijuana using the isolated North Coast area of Santa Cruz County. These rumors were substantiated in 1988 when narcotics officers interrupted a group of smugglers off loading nine tons of marijuana from a ship in the Davenport area.

This region has several popular tourist and vacation destinations. For example, according to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, in the city of San Francisco the population virtually doubles each weekday from 750,000 to one and one-half million persons. In the county of Santa Cruz, nearly 200,000 people per day during the summer months, as well as extended holidays such as "spring break" and Easter week, converge upon the county. The population influx creates not only a viable market for the street-drug dealer but also increased violence and victimization.

The prevalent drugs in this area tend to be marijuana and methamphetamine followed closely by cocaine. The use of heroin is currently in vogue in San Francisco and law enforcement agencies are seeing younger and younger users. Based upon drug seizure statistics and intelligence reports from narcotics task forces in the region, over the past two years there has been an upswing in the sales, usage and importation of marijuana and methamphetamine, as well as the manufacturing of methamphetamine, among the inhabitants of the region. According to regional data and intelligence reports, clandestine methamphetamine laboratories are springing up all over the region.

Counties vulnerable to marijuana cultivation in this region primarily involve the coastal mountain ranges which includes Santa Cruz County. With only 441 square miles in land area, Santa Cruz county is the second smallest county in the State of California. It has approximately 238,900 permanent residents, although its geographical composition is predominately rural and two-thirds (2/3) of its area is classified as forest land by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Because of its (1) central location within the State; (2) the University of California campus in the City of Santa Cruz; and (3) its spectacular coastline, accessible beaches, forested mountains, and numerous state parks, all in proximity to several northern California metropolitan areas, Santa Cruz County is a popular and major tourist destination. Consequently, in spite of its relatively small population and geographic size, Santa Cruz County has become a mecca in the Northern California drug trade. The County has been used as a major port of entry by off-shore drug smugglers; its marijuana cultivation industry is the third largest in the state; its rugged coastal mountains are ideal for concealing illicit drug labs; and its street-level drug markets bustle during the influx of summer and holiday tourists.

Marijuana cultivation and trafficking have continued to be a lucrative and ongoing criminal enterprise in this area. Being located near the San Francisco bay area enables local marijuana growers from Santa Cruz have access to a large population of marijuana users, who are quite willing to purchase locally grown cannabis at a premium price. Currently, locally grown marijuana is being sold in Santa Cruz County for \$5,000 to \$6,500 a pound. Marijuana growers have evolved their growing techniques and strains of marijuana plants so that detection from aerial overflights is difficult. Many growers have learned to conceal their illegal crop in thick manzanita that is prevalent in the mountainous terrain of these counties. Further, growers have developed strains of marijuana that are a different color and shape than normal marijuana plants.

Many marijuana growers have found that cultivating marijuana indoors is safer, reduces the chance of having their illegal crop discovered by law enforcement and thieves and provides the grower with a year round growing environment. The trend towards indoor grows continues to increase.

Region IV

This southern central region is comprised of Fresno, Inyo, Kern, King, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, and Tulare Counties. With the exception of Fresno County's moderate population density, the population density of the remaining counties is low.

These counties tend to be mostly rural and are geographically comprised of foothill to mountainous terrain with an abundance of agricultural land. There are numerous recreational areas in this region, including the national parks of Yosemite, Sequoia, and Kings Canyon and the national forests of Sequoia and Inyo. Additionally, there are Bureau of Land Management lands, Indian Reservations and State parks. The multiple recreational opportunities can add thousands of visitors to these areas on any given day. There are several major north-south highways that serve as convenient thoroughfare for the drug trafficking between areas including, but not limited to, the major metropolitan areas of California, as well as adjoining states and Mexico.

The comparatively low cost of living in several counties in this region coupled with the seasonal agricultural operations and migrant farm workers has caused this area to

experience an increase in population. With this population increase has come violent street gang members who continue to engage in drug sales as well as in the manufacture of controlled substances. The unemployment rate is high. Many of the region's inhabitants are living below the poverty level. A high percentage of the residents receive public assistance. Due to the rural nature of a lot of this area, the geographical layout and sparse population of many acres, drug users and manufacturers of drug find this area appealing to engage themselves in illicit drug use and manufacturing of drugs, including the growing and harvesting of marijuana.

Gang populations in these counties has continued to increase. In calendar year 1995, Merced County law enforcement agencies have identified approximately 40 gangs with more than 700 members. Specific gangs have been connected to drug trafficking as a defined activity, as well as drug exchange for weapons.

In Kern County, of the 5,190 active adult felony probation cases in the county, 2492 (48%) are narcotic related. In Merced County, approximately 25% of all probationers supervised are on probation for an arrest and conviction involving substance abuse. This does not account for probationers with substance abuse lifestyles placed on probation for property offenses committed to finance a substance abuse problem, or violent offenses committed as a result of drug use.

The most prevalent drug in this region is methamphetamine, closely followed by marijuana, then cocaine. Historically, the primary drug of choice in Kern County has been marijuana, cocaine and heroin, however, methamphetamine use, sales and manufacturing has been very prevalent for the past few years. In Inyo County the primary drug problem is methamphetamine and marijuana, the appearance of cocaine is very limited. The Merced/Mariposa Narcotic Task Force has identified that the drug most used and sold in those counties is methamphetamine. Agents have learned through intelligence, investigation, and arrests that large quantities of methamphetamine are being manufactured in this region.

In the fiscal year 1995/1996, the task force in Merced County intercepted three large shipments of ephedrine tablets (commonly used to manufacture methamphetamine), which experts assessed would produce approximately 60 pounds of methamphetamine.

Region V

Region V is comprised of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura and Los Angeles counties. The population density of these counties vary from low in San Luis Obispo, moderate in Santa Barbara, high in Ventura and excessively high in Los Angeles. All contain sparsely populated rural areas.

This region maintains the unique position of being located, on the Pacific coast along Highway 101. The geographical location of these counties provides easy access from several major metropolitan areas and Mexico. In addition, all four counties offer areas of undetectable coastal access for off-shore drug smuggling. Tourist and business travel into Los Angeles enhances the ability of drug shipments into the region due to the sheer volume of cargo and passenger baggage handled on a yearly basis by the ports, international airport and regional airports. Therefore, task force efforts are also directed at these areas on an on-going basis.

Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo counties have large gang populations. Narcotic investigations clearly show a gang link in the narcotics trade for both counties. Gangs in Los Angeles, especially Mexican American gangs, can be tracked back as far as the early 1920's. These were originally established in barrios as a way of protecting and uniting a community. Today their influence can be felt statewide and they play a major role in manufacturing and distribution of methamphetamine and marijuana in the region.

Many Hispanic gangs involve family members and relatives in the U.S. and Mexico. Loyalty remains high and the price for betrayal can be death. Thus prosecution of leaders in these organizations is notoriously difficult compared to other drug organizations since few defendants cooperate with law enforcement. The crack cocaine trade remains the domain of black gangs (Crips and Bloods) in the inner cities and especially in the City of Los Angeles.

While methamphetamine use and sales have become an overwhelming problem for law enforcement in Ventura county. Santa Barbara county reports a rise in the use of heroin and "home grown" marijuana. Drug Court statistics for 61 clients living in Santa Barbara City shows 58% of them using heroin as their drug of choice. In 1993 law enforcement destroyed 26 marijuana plants. Within the first six months of 1996, 644 plants were destroyed. Although not representative of major marijuana production, it does show that our efforts must continue and that for some regions, production is on the rise.

Because methamphetamine is locally produced and is relatively easy to manufacture the supply is abundant. Another reason for the popularity of methamphetamine is that it is relatively inexpensive when compared to cocaine. The effects of methamphetamine also lasts longer, which is pleasing to the non-chronic user.

Region VI

This area includes San Bernardino, Riverside and Orange counties. All these counties have large, densely populated areas which are experiencing drug and gang-related crime. These counties are also traversed by numerous interstate and intrastate highways which allows for the easy growth/production and then distribution of marijuana, methamphetamine and to a lesser extent heroin and cocaine. Additionally, Riverside and San Bernardino counties have substantial remote areas that are sparsely populated.

San Bernardino County receives funding for the Anti-Drug Abuse and Marijuana Suppression Program.

The geographical diversity of San Bernardino county, with its national forests and natural water resource, as well as its interstate highways makes it very conducive for the cultivation and trafficking of marijuana (wholesale value is between \$3,000 to \$5,000 per pound). Illegal Mexican Nationals are contributing to the marijuana problem, as they tend to protect the plants until they mature. These undocumented workers provide a barrier between law enforcement and the heads of large marijuana organizations. Prosecution of these illegal Mexican Nationals is also very difficult because, once released from custody, they flee to Mexico and are rarely re-apprehended.

All three counties are experiencing a dramatic increase in the manufacture, distribution and use of methamphetamine. In San Bernardino county, in 1994 the Sheriff's Department located and dismantled 236 clandestine laboratories, in 1995 the number rose to 363. These drug lab sites varied from operations so small as to be accommodated in car trunks, to those situated in motel rooms, to "pilot plants" often associated with the Mexican Nationals.

Riverside county is one of the major methamphetamine manufacturing and distribution areas in the county. The problem is becoming so severe that from January through August 1996, 201 methamphetamine labs were dismantled by law enforcement agencies in western Riverside County alone.

As previously indicated, all the counties in Region VI sit alongside the main overland drug smuggling corridor from Mexico into Los Angeles and other points in the West. Mexico is the source county for heroin and marijuana and a primary staging point for the smuggling of cocaine into the United States and through the highways located in Region VI. Methamphetamine is also being transported from laboratories run by Mexican Nationals on both sides of the border. The precursor chemical ephedrine, obtained in the interior of Mexico, is being smuggled along with hydriodic acid into the United States through these well-established routes.

Violence associated with illicit drug activity, either on the part of individuals, gangs, or organized crime, coupled particularly with firearms, has contributed to the overall crime problems in Region VI.

Street gangs involved in drug sales have moved into these counties and contribute to the increased violence on the streets, as well as supplying narcotics for sale to finance their activities.

Region VII

Region VII is comprised of San Diego and Imperial counties. This area is on the Mexican border harboring the largest number of Mexican illegal aliens. While San Diego County is has one of the largest cities in the U.S. it also has great expanses of rural areas in the eastern and northern portions. Imperial County is primarily rural with the City of El Centro being the only significant population center for the entire county.

While Riverside County has been referred to as the methamphetamine capitol of world, Imperial has been identified as the cocaine corridor. Most trafficking organizations in this region are now primarily made up of Mexican Nationals involved in the production and distribution of illegal drugs. The San Diego County Strike Force reports that almost 75% of juveniles and adults who have been arrested, had tried methamphetamine in the year prior to their arrest. In fact, within three days of their arrest, 60% of adults and 20% of juveniles had used methamphetamine.

Cocaine, heroin, marijuana and the majority of the precursor chemicals used to make methamphetamine enter this region primarily from Mexico. Mexico does not regulate precursor chemicals.

The availability of prevalent drugs may be indicated by the fact that 136 Drug Enforcement Agents and 21 Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement (BNE) agents are assigned to San Diego alone. Imperial County, at the request of the United States Attorney and Boarder Patrol, has it own team of special agents. Imperial is also used as a training area for the Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement Agents. Teams of BNE agents converge to Imperial County periodically to work the varied aspects of the county's drug trade. Still another resource in Region VII is Operation Alliance. This is an alliance of over 80 federal, state and local officers who interdict drugs at the international border with Mexico. Local Law enforcement agencies contribute another 160 officers to conduct drug investigations.

Both San Diego and Imperial counties have created highly effective specialized prosecution task forces to specifically handle gang/narcotic offenders. San Diego has had a history of using highly innovative buy/walk programs using informants and audio/video recorders to document drug sales. Other special operations conducted have resulted in several hundred gang related arrests.

San Diego reports that gang membership in their county has been on the rise since the early 1970s. Estimated gang membership has gone from 300 in 1975 to 11,500 in 1996. They have 62 gang sets and 4,500 documented gang members. Their traditional territorial turf wars have given rise to narcotics turf wars. As with Los Angeles County, along with the rise in gang/narcotic violence, the sophistication and availability of weapons have elevated from revolvers to semi-automatic handguns, Uzi submachine guns, and Soviet made AK-47 assault rifles.

Price and Purity Analysis (Major Drugs)

Methamphetamine: Criminal justice intelligence reports indicate the costs associated with the distribution, sale, and consumption of the four major drugs remain static. Criminal justice professionals report mixed reviews concerning the price and purity of dangerous and illegal drugs. As an example, methamphetamine production across all regions are increasing. Costs are still inexorably tied to demand, prevalence, and availability. BNE reports the number of clandestine labs raided continues to rise from 419 in 1994 to 559 in 1995. During the first six calendar months of 1996, over 500 laboratory seizures have been recorded. Interestingly, WSIN reports that 66% of the laboratories were seized in residences, e.g., detached garages, backyard sheds, barns, bedrooms, and bathrooms; 16% in trailers, cars, and trucks; and 7% in hotel/motel rooms. The remainder were discovered on ranches, farms/orchards, storage lockers, agricultural areas, etc. Methamphetamine is the substance of greatest production. WSIN and BNE reports that, among arrests made by narcotic task forces, the most commonly used drug has been methamphetamine.

Demand has not waned and drug trafficking organizations have found ways of circumventing the regulation of ephedrine, a precursor chemical used in the manufacture of methamphetamine. Instead, psuedoephedrine tablets are being used as a substitute. Accurate purity percentages cannot be determined, however, on average, all affected regions report purity estimates ranging from between 40-95%. Add this estimate to the number of "meth overdoses" admitted to hospitals, that also increased from 13 deaths in 1991 to 35 in 1995. Estimates are not available for 1996, but a conservative estimate

would be in excess of 1995 estimates. Nationally, meth-related deaths tripled between 1991 and 1994, from 151 to 433.

Marijuana: Recently, California has been plagued with a number of natural disasters that may not have had an effect on production, cultivation, or purity of marijuana in remote, rural regions. To circumvent detection, more “grow sites” have been encountered indoors, compared to remote, heavily vegetated locations. Within the last several years, two separate and distinct markets involving cultivation and sales have emerged. On the one hand, southern border regions such as San Diego Imperial counties report that as multiton shipments of marijuana reaches distribution corridors in these regions, costs are seasonal and subject to marginal fluctuations. Increased costs are often associated with demand and availability. However, this is not a standard that can be too often applied. In northern rural California counties nearest the “Emerald Triangle” (Trinity, Humboldt, and Mendocino counties), which constitutes the second market location, costs are relatively stable, possibly in response to the poor economic environment within this region. Purity level estimates continue to remain around 22-40% tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) content. This high potency content continues to make marijuana more in demand by drug users in California.

Heroin: Estimates of purity levels for heroin vary from 10-80% between regions reporting. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) sites report that in 1995, the number of male users have declined by at least 10% and is the least likely drug to show up in the DUF arrestee population. Using DUF sites such as San Diego, San Francisco, and Los Angeles as barometers of demand, it would appear that populations having access to this drug are more often seeking treatment, rather continuing to participate in the demand curve. Supply is still prevalence and consumed by the more “hard core” abuser.

Purity levels between Mexican brown and Southeast Asian heroin could not be determined based on the data reported by agencies within the seven California regions. Compared to the last analysis of this trend in the 1996 Strategy, demand continues to increase in areas populated by Asian ethnic groups. Heroin popularity and availability is as abundant now as it was previously.

Sources for heroin have come from as far as Southeast Asia and Columbia, to as close as Mexico. Mexican drug trafficking organizations tend to capitalize on storing quantities of heroin in northern Mexico until drug transactions can be arranged. Smaller quantities of heroin are then smuggled across the border through ports of entry, with larger quantities of cocaine and marijuana. This trend may have an affect on cost, which have been estimated at varying between \$20,000 to \$150,000 per kilo. On average again, Mexican brown, compared to Southeast Asian heroin tends to be more expensive. These prices vary greatly between reporting regions.

Cocaine: Demand for cocaine continues to increase in all reporting regions. Purity level estimates for crack cocaine vary from 40-95%, while purity estimates for powder cocaine vary between 20-80% among reporting regions. Joint law enforcement operations between U.S. Customs, Border Patrol, BNE, DEA, and participating Byrne-funded projects indicate source countries include Columbia, Mexico, Canada, and other international locations. It appears that the heaviest trafficking activities occur around major port of entry, such as coastal locations in San Diego county, San Francisco, and Imperial county. However, infiltration routes for cocaine honey-comb the entire state, using existing drug trafficking corridors originating primarily from southern and coastal regions through the

central valley to distribution centers located throughout California. Intense joint interdiction activities initiated by task forces have been effective in limiting the number of opportunities drug traffic organizations have to stage drug shipments where task forces concentrate enforcement efforts.

Areas of Greatest Need

Violent crime and drug problems continue to vary in degree across California. Published intelligence reports received from WSIN, BNE, U.S Border Patrol, along with progress reports received from participating Byrne funded projects comprise the basis for this assertion. Factoring in certain economic indicators such as employment, available housing, environmental safety, and other quality of life concerns, these influences tend to have an affect on the way people live, as well as their perception of safety considerations within their immediate environment. California places the highest possible priority on these concerns in all jurisdictions.

The foundation of California's Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program was based on responding to the local needs of communities hardest hit by violent crime and illegal drugs. The ADA Enforcement Program, is based primarily on predetermined allocations to each county and not by competitive Request-For-Proposal (RFP). This allocation takes into consideration that, given the program parameters of the Byrne Block Grant Program, each participating county would articulate and target areas of greatest need. These needs are then articulated through selected federally authorized program purposes areas that are then converted into program objectives, activities, and performance measures. Since the inception of this program, funding distribution was based on a base rate of \$150,000 per county. An increase beyond the base rate was determined by computing the percentage of major crimes reported by each county, compared to the California Crime Index. These major crimes include homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and larceny. Based on the resulting percentage, additional funding is provided to augment the base amount. The scope of the funding distribution applies uniformly to all 58 counties. A central tendency occurs when larger counties supporting larger populations report higher levels of major crime, thereby receiving higher allocations beyond the base rate. Conversely, smaller and more rural counties, supporting smaller populations and proportionately lower frequencies of major crimes, receive the smaller allocations beyond the base rate.

Discussions contained in the previous section (*Analysis of Drug and Crime Problems and Trends*), discloses a few intimate perceptions concerning geographical variances in relationship to crime patterns and trends throughout California. That, added to verbal and written comments made at the recently held public meetings, underscores the divergence between what constitutes "need" in one locality, compared to needs described in another. For example, projects currently funded under this program have established activities that target either street, mid-level, or major drug traffickers. Problem statements developed by individual projects provide a wealth of information concerning the scope and nature of the problem from an individualized county perspective as it relates to this central program feature.

This information also provides some degree of validating the areas of greatest need within geographical settings, based on drug use and violent crime correlations involving youthful and adult offenders, for each county. Yet this data continues to be influenced by factors beyond the capacities of counties participating in this program. Crime patterns, whether or not there are law enforcement interventions, will still occur. Frequencies of the occurrence will diminish in direct relationship to the amount of resources and the intensity of efforts being brought to bare on the

problem. Then, as if by some “cause and effect” phenomenon, the problem will ordinarily relocate to another less resource intensive area.

Participants who attended the recently convened public meetings offered commentary on what was perceived as areas of greatest need within counties participating in this program. An example of some of these needs included the following:

- Larger and more densely populated counties proposed that the base funding allocations for smaller counties be reduced to support program efforts needed to confront ever increasing violent crime and drug problems;
- Smaller and more rural county representatives indicated that, without Byrne funding, addressing violent crime and illegal drug issues would be virtually impossible. Further, it was disclosed that, should the base funding amount be reduced, mounting a concerted enforcement/drug interdiction effort within vulnerable rural counties would be equally difficult;
- The needs of smaller, more rural counties would be better served by modifying the funding allocation formula. A recommendation was made to include a “production” factor within the structure of the funding allocation. This factor would consider the illegal drug production results from a reporting county as a method of determining the base amount for county funding. Some counties feel that reporting crime index information prevents smaller counties from acquiring additional funding, simply because of the comparatively lower number of reported major crimes; and
- The majority of the participants agreed that, based on statewide allocations, a competitive program would be counter productive. It would not essentially address areas of greatest need for any particular region. It would only serve to isolate counties that had not adequately addressed county needs in sufficient detail. Excluding non-participating counties would essentially create a situation that would lead to a gradual or eventual shift in crime trends and problems to the county having little or no resources to exert on emerging problems. For this reason, program participants strongly endorse the use of a statewide funding allocation, supported by a Request-For-Application. Problem statement components of the application requires that program participants discuss local areas of greatest need in detail, as it pertains to the county submitting the application.

Currently, there are no standardized, precise, and objective indicators that would validate the areas of greatest need, by either region, geographical location, or population size. An example was given by comparing Mendocino County with Los Angeles and Riverside Counties. Whereas, Mendocino county, part of the *Emerald Triangle*, is considered one three rural counties, e.g., Trinity and Humboldt, identified as major marijuana and methamphetamine producing rural counties of the pacific northwest. Yet, Los Angeles and Riverside counties are experiencing increased drug trafficking and violent crime activities between Black and Hispanic gang members, along with other criminal organizations in the southern border region. These patterns are emerging as a result of territorial conflicts involving transshipments of precursor drugs used in methamphetamine production, originating from the Mexican border, cocaine and crack distribution and sales. In effect, both locations have identified areas of greatest need.

Further, both locations have shown the capacity of presenting convincing data that would support their separate view of representing an area having the greatest need, irrespective of

population size or current funding allocations. The kinds of issues that appear to be equally important with respect to issue identification are:

- What kinds of additional resources .e.g., time, funding, equipment, and manpower, are needed to substantially address violent crime and drug problems within California? and;
- To what extent are service gaps identified and how can these gaps be addressed?

Resource Needs and Gaps in Services

A relatively effective barometer for determining the adequacy of the Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program in meeting short and long term goals is to assess whether additional resources are needed and whether or not gaps in services have occurred. The primary forum used to make objective determinations is through testimony and written comments during scheduled public meetings. Often, the responses tend to be subjective in nature, but nonetheless this information is combined with other information resources. This information includes data received by Anti-Drug Abuse Program staff during progress report review, scheduled project site visits, and the results obtained when these projects are monitored for program compliance by OCJP Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Branch staff. Program success potential, as well as additional resource requirements, along with gaps in service tend to materialize.

California elaborated further on resource needs and gaps in service in the 1996 Statewide Strategy. This discussion provided a “regionalized perspective” concerning additional resources that were needed and whether gaps in services existed in a particular region. The basis of this discussion was derived from evaluation results obtained through Mr. Terence Dunworth, evaluation consultant, Justice Systems Support and Development (JSSD). The results of this evaluation can no longer be used to determine current resource needs and gaps in service, as the evaluation centered on previous grant years. Additionally, current strategy development criteria asks that states provide discussion from a component-based perspective, rather than from a comprehensive regional approach. In this regard, the discussion that follows will address perceived addition resource needs and any gaps in services from that perspective. The exception will be to avoid providing discussion for components with no known additional resource needs.

Prevention

Currently, developing mechanisms designed to meet the prevention needs of communities with in California are being met through components found in the Marijuana Suppression; 12 sites, and High-Risk Youth Programs; 2 sites. These programs are within the major program setting of the Byrne Block Grant Program. Yet, to fully realize active integration of prevention activities into the current BJA criteria, program implementation flexibility must be expanded. Collectively, there are 12 project sites located throughout California for the programs identified earlier. Simple mathematics will indicate that these programs only partially satisfy the needs of 58 counties statewide.

Current funding available for program evaluation purposes is not sufficient to assess whether these programs have the potential of being replicated throughout the state. At a minimum, this would be necessary to determine whether there are direct benefits that could be derived from integrating prevention components within a law enforcement/suppression framework. Therefore, determining whether additional resources would be needed to

prevent initial criminal activities would be subjective and premature, without formal evaluation.

During the strategy development process, several discoveries were made concerning the number of major state agencies receiving federal funds for prevention program implementation. Given the short time frame to develop the strategy, prevention program summaries were reviewed to determine where similarities with the Byrne Block Grant Program existed. Existing resources could be better utilized if the program standards of other State Administrative Agencies (SAAs) were redefined to determine the “best fit” between state agencies. This means that, universally, most prevention programs require local government to convene a coordinating body to develop action plans designed to reduce, juvenile delinquency and violence, teen pregnancy, youth and adult drug abuse, etc. However, other programs running parallel to these programs and administered by other SAAs, very seldom recognize the importance of collaborative, coordinating activities that would reduce redundancy in program implementation.

In terms of an overall perspective, OCJP has been the SAA for prevention programs that are separate from the Byrne Block Grant Program. This includes programs under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Program, along with the Gang Violence Suppression (GVS) Program. Resources have been brought to bear from varying perspectives within these program settings. Gaps exist in terms of the number of communities these programs can adequately serve. To recommend that additional resources are needed to more fully integrate prevention activities within this framework would be an admission that current resources are ineffectual. This is clearly not the case. There must first be some evidence that full integration of prevention activities within the framework of the Anti-Drug Abuse Program garners overall benefits within the program. Testimony received from project participants indicate that marginal collaboration occurs between law enforcement and prevention.

California is moving toward more specific identification of additional resource needs in this area, which may indicate whether or not there is an actual gap in services provided to communities. This action will take place primarily through the Public Safety Directors’ Group (PSDG). The PSDG will be the policy/advisory board comprised of representatives from major state agencies who have an abiding understanding of the elements of program service characteristics and standards of program implementation across agency boundaries. Through this forum, a gap in service provision may indicate additional resource needs. A careful assessment of those needs will be made to assure that, should additional resources be required, it will be allocated to the program having the greatest impact and potential for success. Initially, this may extend beyond the program implications of the Byrne Block Grant Program, but will reinforce priorities discussed in the National Drug Control Policy.

Law Enforcement

Testimony provided during recent public meetings indicated that additional resources are need and service gaps may exist in the following areas:

Clandestine Laboratory Dismantling: Through intensive law enforcement suppression activities, more clandestine laboratories are being discovered. Between January and July 1996, 503 clandestine laboratories had been dismantled. Far more were discovered than

could be successfully destroyed. The limiting factor, even with a combined, collaborative approach between other state and local agencies, was the absence of adequate dedicated resources, e.g., manpower, hazard material (HAZMAT) safety equipment, and funding for cleanup activities. Existing resources can only assure that the larger sites, present an eminent danger to communities and the environment, will get first priority. Reduced resources allocated to other equally important law enforcement activities sends a subtle message to offenders that production of illegal drugs is a profitable enterprise, as law enforcement can not handle the number of laboratories producing toxic and dangerous materials.

Non-traditional law enforcement activities: Throughout the execution of Byrne funded activities, rural law enforcement agencies have indicated difficulties in participating on larger task forces, due lack of staffing resources. Often, small, rural counties must combine efforts with adjoining counties and in so doing, lose a degree of service focus within their counties, as well as some level of autonomy. Other problems surface concerning the method in which the task force addresses smaller county violent crime and drug issues. Program flexibility, as well as additional resources are needed to develop program activities under the Byrne Program, that would better serve small rural counties.

Written and verbal testimony given at public meetings and other forums, indicate that a clear gap in service would occur in the absence of those resources. Current funding distribution for smaller counties does not provide the kind of funding flexibility to increase current allocations in support of additional staffing, equipment replacement, or any other resources. Projects located in rural counties ordinarily are driven to make self restricting decisions to acquire a much needed resource by forfeiting another much needed resource. Giving smaller counties incentives to be diverse in program approaches is not an option currently undertaken by the SAA.

During the course of the multiyear strategy, a program survey will be developed to determine whether task forces and existing program activities best suits the needs of smaller counties. The survey will also explore other programmatic options that are not as confining as are some of the program settings under the Byrne Block Grant Program. These options may fall outside the conventions currently stated within current program settings. The point being, is to provide effective opportunities for smaller counties to develop activities that supports the major tenets and priorities of the Byrne Block Grant Program, while filling existing gaps in services within the targeted location. This would not necessarily imply increasing resources, but a reallocation of existing resources into a new program setting that supports smaller rural county needs. Currently, there is a gap in service, simply because current service does appear to reach nor satisfy rural county needs. This may not be a BJA problem, but a program flexibility problem best handled by satisfying the needs of smaller counties through program restructuring. A visionary approach may be required as the multiyear strategy unfolds in year two and three.

Adjudication

Adjudication activities occur in the majority of programs currently implemented under the Byrne Block Grant Program. The prosecution component, along with the law enforcement and probation components, is the foundation of the Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program. Current resources are stretched at or near capacity, due to intensive prosecution efforts regarding the acceptance of cases involving career criminal prosecution,

vertical prosecution of drug traffickers, and connecting the drug treatment effort to drug court programs.

Additional resource requirements were not identified as an issue during public meetings. However, through the dynamic of increases in drug and violent crime, court cases are increasing, sometimes beyond the county district attorneys staff and courts capacity to handle them in a timely and efficient manner. Court systems statewide are consolidating their municipal and superior courts to establish more efficiencies within the system. This has caused existing court staff and judges to assume multiple roles within this new configuration. The result is beginning to have an adverse impact on court dispositions for drug and violent crime related offenses. Case management system technologies are not keeping pace with the intensity of the number of cases that require tracking and disposition. Resources are also needed to reinforce the known successes of alternative sentencing and diversion programs, such as improved laboratory analysis equipment, portable and more reliable drug testing capabilities. Further additional resources are needed to augment prosecution and court staff when determinations are required to provide treatment sanctions to offenders suspected of habituating to more than one dangerous drug.

Resources have been applied to this problem through the early disposition, and court delay reduction programs. However, these programs are presented as options for participating counties and have only marginal effect within the county of operation. Los Angeles, Riverside, and Santa Clara counties are the only three counties using these programs as strategies to provide resources to overcome the adverse impact of extremely high court case backlogs. Program expansion, to include additional staff and equipment resources are needed. This trend occurs more frequently in larger metropolitan areas such as San Diego, San Bernardino, and Orange counties. High court case backlogs are also increasing incrementally in central valley counties such as Kern, Kings, Fresno, San Joaquin, and Sacramento counties.

Gaps in services may have contraindications of the overall impact for the need for additional resources. Data presented in the *Current Efforts Section* of this strategy may not indicate that this is the case. However, the potential for even more of a success may be constrained or limited due to the absence of these needed resources.

Corrections and Treatment

Under the Byrne Block Grant Program, funds are currently allocated to the California Department of Corrections (CDC), Office of Substance Abuse Programs (OSAP) and the California Youth Authority (CYA), for correctional drug treatment programs. Successes achieved by CDC have been heralded in national publications and evaluation reports that substantiates drug treatment interventions that directly benefit the abuser, as well as society. However, drug related crimes have increased to the point where existing resources allocated to drug treatment cannot satisfy the demand.

Additional resources are needed to expand the in-custody treatment and aftercare components of this critically important program. Some criminal justice system agencies have somehow become reluctant to agree with the successes achieved by this program. Yet, the treatment communities that is comprised of state and local program professionals have presented proof to the contrary. Limited financial resources are currently available

through the Byrne Block Grant Program. The Corrections Program Office (CPO) of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) has a similar program called the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program for State Prisoners. The difference is one of programmatic and fiscal limitations. Whereas, in the Byrne funded program, funds may be allocated to the in-custody and community treatment (aftercare) component. Conversely, the RSAT Program requires that funds can only be used to support in-custody treatment interventions and not the aftercare component of the program. This difference may demonstrate an intentional gap in the services provided to the same target group. However, the funds used to establish both programs are received from the Bureau of Justice Assistant, albeit, from different program areas, e.g., State and Local Assistance Division (Byrne) and the Corrections Program Office (RSAT).

The program would be better served if these two program funding opportunities were consolidated to provide more opportunities to expand existing programs for drug treatment at the state and local level. With this program consolidation, program implementation criteria should also be combined to form a more uniform and consistent treatment of overall program approach. This approach should be to reduce drug dependence among criminal offenders in our state prisons, local jails and correctional facilities. By realigning this approach, additional funding would not be required. Instead existing allocations would be used at a greater level of efficiency.

Information Systems and Technological Improvements

California's most recently submitted State Annual Report for FY 1995/96 attested to the number of improvements made to date. The issue of resource requirements cannot be discussed without understanding the mounting costs for goods and services regarding information technology. Added to this fact is understanding the need for political support is as important as the acquisition of additional financial resources to improve the system.

An important resource need within this system is technologically improved software for the LiveSCAN component of California's Long Range Automation Plan. The LiveSCAN component of the plan has the purpose of electronically capturing fingerprint images and arrest data at the booking point. Current software is insufficient, as current vendors must develop data validation software to correspond to the needs of DOJ's existing automated information system. Cost increases over the past several years has delayed full implementation of this component of California's Long Range Plan.

California is also involved in broadening the scope of current information systems by linking criminal justice intelligence databases to other information networks. This is being done through the Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System (SWBSADIS). Participants currently include California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, which comprises one secure network. This system was first envisioned by the Southwest Border States Governor's Coalition, in response to the illegal drug problems occurring in the four state region. SWBSADIS has also established a Senior Management Team, with representation from all participating states, that also includes the executive director, OCJP. This decision-making body focuses on policy and funding issues.

Gaps currently exist between state intelligence repositories due primarily to the differences between systems, e.g., hardware and software characteristics, regulatory requirements. The same situation has occurred within the state between local users and the

state repository. However, the gap is lessening due to active discussions, action plan implementation by the State Attorney General's Committee on Criminal History Records Improvement. Committee members provide input and offer recommendations that have been incorporated into current and future systems development and design.

Evaluation

In recent years, California has attempt to seize opportunities to replicate programs having the most effect on violent crime and drug problems. Planning activities have been centered around using the results obtained during process and impact evaluations of the Byrne Block Grant Program. However, due to limitations currently in place on the amount of funds that can be allocated for the evaluation process, program replication is often delayed.

The California Legislature has determined that evaluation costs should not rise above \$50,000 per evaluation. This constraint creates evaluation planning and implementation difficulties, as process evaluation costs can easily exceed this limitation. This amount can also be exceeded during impact evaluations. The majority (63.2%) of the federal allocation is distributed to local agencies for program continuance and implementation, while 32% is allocated to state agencies. The remaining 5% is retained by the SAA for administrative support costs. The result is that allocations are not available to support evaluation costs. At best, evaluations may only sample some of the more prominent programs and then to a limited extent. Additional financial resources are needed to conduct comprehensive evaluations to determine the feasibility of program replication, revision, or improvement. It is estimated that no less than \$250,000 would be needed to conduct process/impact based evaluations. This conservative estimate is based on prerequisite features of the evaluation process that includes evaluation field team development and related costs, evaluation methodology development, statewide travel and related costs, data collection, reporting, and analysis. Evaluation results will also be an indicator of whether or not Byrne funded programs are serving the best interests and needs of communities in California.

PRIORITIES AND PROGRAM RESPONSES

The rationale and purpose of this section is to transition from a strategy-based philosophy to a priority-based approach. What follows are the major priorities that were once articulated in terms of strategies in last year's strategy. This was done to show transitional linkages between what the program features and priorities were then, compared to what program intends in the future, using an expanded view of those priorities. These priorities remain aligned with the National Drug Control Priorities and Policy. They have been tailored, not changed, to reflect how best California intends to use and allocate resources, programs, and activities, in support of long range goals of this program. Linkages between priorities and the programs that address these priorities will be comprehensive, as well as obvious. At the conclusion of the analysis of each program, a brief discussion will unfold concerning future program projections of potentially key activities under each program. These projections have been designed to be flexible in the event that, as the year progresses, other key discoveries within that particular program setting materialize.

In response to the discussion of priority issues, the programs described were developed and representative of the foundation of California's approach aimed at reducing, if not eliminating

the influence of violent crime and drugs. An analysis will be provided for each program, followed by statements of longer-term goal(s), as appropriate, to the program discussed. These goal statements will apply to year two and three of California's Multiyear Statewide Strategy.

This system of discussion provides California with more opportunities for system wide improvements, yet remaining focused on how our programs address the needs of California. Information that reflect the current efforts and accomplishments for all funded programs are not included in this narrative. This is due to the submission deadline for the 1997 Multiyear Statewide Strategy of January 10, 1997. Projects have a reporting timeline for submitting the first six-month progress report, that reflects current efforts underway for FY 1996/97 to OCJP no later than January 31, 1997. Otherwise, the narrative fully supports the required format elements required by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, State and Local Assistance Division (SLAD).

Priority One: Reduce drug use and violence in California.

Priority Statement: Violent crime can be directly attributable to drug use in California. The effects of these two problems continue to plague populations within every county. Statewide efforts are having an effect on these problems, but have not caused a significant reduction in crime, or the transportation, distribution, sales, and use of dangerous drugs. Violent crime, while having decreased by 7 percent between 1994 and 1995, is still at an unacceptable level. Byrne -funded projects throughout the state note a significant link between violent crime and the drug trade.

Current Efforts

Program: Multijurisdictional Task Force Program (Federal Program Purpose #2)

California has allocated funds to 45 continuing projects statewide who actively investigate and apprehend narcotic offenders. Probation officers assist law enforcement by targeting felony probationers. Experienced prosecutors from county district attorney offices are assigned to handle task force generated cases. Outside agencies provide staff to compliment the efforts of the task force. Additionally, funded projects conduct investigations and tactical law enforcement operations, using features of the multijurisdictional task forces, that also includes the integration of federal and state drug enforcement agencies. These agencies currently include U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, DEA, ATF, BNE, the California Highway Patrol, and the U.S. Forestry Service.

Projected Program Accomplishments: The following is a brief discussion of the major accomplishments that are planned to occur during the 1997 funding year. This discussion is by no means exhaustive, but underscores the major and potentially most influential objectives and activities for this program. A complete listing of current program abstracts that provides greater details of planned programs, including all objectives, activities and performance measures, are contained in the appendix.

Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Conduct special investigations using prosecution, law enforcement, and probation components, integrating federal, state, and local drug enforcement agencies. The key events will continue to be to pursue, investigate, and prosecute drug traffickers, who manufacture, transport, distribute, and sell illegal drugs.

Activities will include coordinating joint enforcement efforts that specifically target offenders, including drug trafficking organizations who traffic, manufacture, distribute, and sell illegal drugs.

- Task force components will surveil, investigate, arrest, and prosecute task force generated drug offender cases within locations requiring intervention.

Activities for the law enforcement will include the service of arrest and search warrants of known drug offenders, assisted by prosecution to assure legality and procedural consistency. The task force prosecutor will also track task force generated cases from initial filing to final disposition. The probation component will assist law enforcement during investigations and field searches of felony probationers.

Year 2 Goal(s): Continue multijurisdictional task force activities. Strengthen the collaborative and cooperative elements of task force operations by including Byrne-like federal funded programs in multijurisdictional operations and task force activities. This may include the participation of U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) district offices in planning and strategy development activities centered near public housing complexes. At a minimum, HUD officials, including housing authority police, will be invited to attend scheduled steering committee and other pertinent planning meetings for information exchange.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue multijurisdictional task force activities. Develop, initiate, and distribute community issue-targeted field surveys designed to determine whether task force operations and activities have addressed local community needs. Build on previous successes with communities and include more prevention-based activities developed through connections with task force members and steering committee attendees. Implement recommendations

PROPOSED NEW PROGRAM

Tentative Program Title: **Clandestine Laboratory Enforcement Program**

Program Justification: In 1996, the use of methamphetamine and its production in clandestine laboratories was identified by law enforcement officials as a problem reaching increasing proportions in California. Increased consumption of “meth” by youth has also created new drug abuse victims in this ongoing drug war. Unprotected and exposed children living in homes whose caregivers fail to understand the hazard implications of “home-grown” methamphetamine labs. Not only do these children live within an

environment where they are exposed to dangerous chemicals, but the hazard they are exposed to are often fatal, due to the very high potential for explosions. Law enforcement officers have repeatedly identified these victims through drug lab raids, but have not had the capability to intervene on behalf of the child.

The Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) will use the federal funds to coordinate law enforcement and prosecution to establish local protocols to intervene on behalf of the victims. The focus of these funds will be on the following activities:

- The formulation of local task forces headed by law enforcement and prosecution. Collaborative agreements will be established between assisting agencies such as social and health services, mental health practitioners, and the Office of Emergency Services, Hazardous Material Division technical staff. This task force will identify as well as clarify the responsibility of each local agency and how each will work together;
- Provide training and technical assistance for law enforcement and prosecution agencies on the issues of child endangerment and its relationship to clandestine drug laboratories.

Should the concept of this proposal be approved, the program will be aligned under the Multi-jurisdictional Task Force Program Title. It is anticipated that at least \$1.2 million in Byrne Formula Block Grant funds will be allocated to this program.

Current Efforts

Program: Special Assignments (Federal Purpose Area #8)

County District Attorneys provide specialized prosecutorial functions executed by highly skilled deputy district attorneys. These skilled professionals prosecute and track project generated cases from initial filing to disposition (sentencing), including probation revocation, and provide specialized services, such as search warrants preparation and review. Currently, two projects focus primarily on prosecution efforts.

Under this program title, program efforts are split between special assignments and vertical prosecution. This was done so satisfy local county needs in the formulation of a strategy designed to be specific to that need. Under the Special Assignments Program, cases generated as result of grant funded task force activities may create excessive workloads for prosecutorial staff. For this reason, the Special Assignments Program was designed to respond to problems by assisting counties with the assignment of experienced prosecutors to handle additional workload.

Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Enhance and compliment task force functions by providing prosecutorial services to law enforcement prior to and after the arrest of offenders.

Attend all court proceeding from preliminary hearings to sentencing.

- Seek the most appropriate sentence or commitment imposed on a convicted project defendant or adjudicated juvenile.

Track the number of offenders that were convicted, compared to those who were not.

Year 2 Goal(s): Consolidate action-based objectives and activities of the Special Assignments and Vertical Prosecution Programs into one program title/feature of the Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program.

Year 3 Goal(s): Based on the successes achieved by the program in previous years, consider expanding the program to locations where task force operations are not present, e.g., small, rural, counties with moderate to high drug and violent crime threat characteristics.

Current Efforts

Program: **Vertical Prosecution (Program Purpose #8)**

Limited resources have stifled past efforts for prosecutors to handle cases from initial filing to sentencing. When cases are handled by more than one prosecutor (major stage selection), case continuity and fragmentation can result, due to the loss of consistent recommendations to the court, on-going continuances, and often dismissal of charges, due to lack a thorough understanding of the case. Prosecutors using vertical prosecution techniques have been effective in improving conviction rates, reducing trauma to victims, and providing more consistent and appropriate sentencing. This program has been implemented in one location in California.

Projected Program Accomplishments:

Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Support increased prosecutorial efforts involving the prosecution of felony drug offenders, through vertical prosecution.

Associated activities include pursuing conviction and ensuring the most appropriate and severe sentence. Prosecutors will assume total responsibility for handling felony drug offender cases from initial filing to sentencing.

- Reduce the assigned project prosecutor's felony offender caseload.

Key activities for this objective will be to handle targeted offenders meeting the criteria for vertical prosecution, thereby reducing caseload levels in order to be fully prepared for all phases of prosecutorial proceedings. Caseload level will be compared to felony non-vertical prosecutors within the county district attorney's office.

- Reduce the average number of days between arrest and disposition of project defendants and increase felony convictions, and eliminate plea bargaining.

Key activities will include speedy adjudication of defendants compared to the actual average time to adjudicate felony defendant. Project attorneys will work closely with investigators to strengthen pendency of the case to enhance prosecutorial efforts.

Year 2 Goal(s): Consolidate the objectives and activities of Special Assignments and Vertical Prosecutions to better serve populations with continuing excessive caseloads regarding felony drug offenders.

Year 3 Goal(s): Consider the expansion of the revised program to underserved/underrepresented locations having higher incidents requiring felony drug offender prosecutions.

Current Efforts

Program: **Assets Forfeiture Program (Program Purpose #9)**

Prosecutors initiate asset forfeiture proceeding that target mid and major-level dealers and manufacturers. The goal of forfeiture is to take the profit out of drug-related crime and place the funds from forfeited assets back into the furtherance of the program. One project has implemented this program.

Projected Program Accomplishments: Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- The law enforcement component will conduct complete and thorough financial investigations.

Key activities will include the initiation and completion of financial investigations simultaneously with narcotics investigations. Other activities will include obtaining as much financial data as possible, prior to seizure and follow up on leads developed as a precursor to the seizure.

- The prosecution component will initiate and complete forfeiture proceedings referred from law enforcement, for appropriate court filing.

Key activities will include coordinating forfeiture activities with law enforcement to assure that the cases referred meets prerequisite criteria for filing.

Year 2 Goal(s): As a result of probable changes in asset forfeiture law, modify program to include the most up-to-date legislation. Increase the number of cases referred for forfeiture proceedings for each project that implement this program.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue existing program consistent with the laws governing seizures and forfeiture proceedings. Continue the pursuit of criminal enterprises and drug trafficking organizations.

Current Efforts

Program: **Court Delay Reduction (Program Purpose #10)**

This program is designed to enhance the administration and processing of drug cases. The program is aimed at reducing case backlogs and delays in current filings which may result from a system wide drug enforcement policy. The CDRP may be implemented in a variety of ways to include: establishing “temporary courts” with retired judges presiding; assigning special research attorneys to assist the judge’s law calendar; providing additional court reporters, court clerks, and calendar coordination; creating or enhancing an automated court management system; providing closed circuit jail arraignments/instituting security and control safeguards to preserve and maintain drug evidence. Currently one county has implemented this program.

Projected Program Accomplishments: **Major Objective and Key Activities:**

- Reduce the number of backlogged drug cases.

A key activity for this objective will be to define case processing management problems confronting the court. Analyze and identify critical events for case management control. And during this key activity, the project will develop case processing and operating goals.

- Increase the number of cases meeting the time-to-disposition standard.

One of the key activities for this objective is to develop a time-to-disposition standard. Circumvent or develop alternatives for

curtailing the causes of delays associated with case processing. Design the alternative to be more streamlined and efficient.

Year 2 Goal(s):

Continue to fund and implement objective and activities of this program.

Year 3 Goal(s):

Determine whether the Administrative Office of the Courts can assess the value of this program to participating court systems. Replicate where program activities are needed.

Apply court delay reduction activities to all prosecution components funded under the Byrne Block Grant Program.

Develop a more stringent time-to-disposition standard, to include identification of cases that would benefit from this kind of process control intervention.

Current Efforts

Program:

Fast Track Prosecution/Fast Track Defense (Program Purpose #10)

The goal of this program is to expedite felony sentencing in the municipal court, through a coordinated effort between prosecutors, public defenders, and the department of probation. The intended result is to attain the maximum number of appropriate felony dispositions (prison terms) at the earliest possible stage of the criminal court process. One county has selected this program title as the primary focus of their efforts.

Projected Program Accomplishments:

Major Objective and Key Activities:

- Obtain the maximum number of appropriate felony dispositions at the earliest possible stage of the criminal court process.

A key activity of this objective will be to adjudicate cases in much shorter time limits than non-project offender cases. A subordinate but equally key to this objective is to reduce the number of municipal court appearances for project attorneys.

- Provide specialized services to eliminate severe congestion in the courts caused by drug related cases.

Key activities include the attainment of lower number of subpoenas for witnesses and lessen the time from arraignment to sentencing by early disposition of cases.

Provide training to district attorneys and public defenders, including the courts.

Year 2 Goal(s): Continue to create prosecution/defender teams to enhance the administration and processing of drug and drug-related cases in the court system.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue to reduce drug related caseloads in the court system.

Current Efforts

Program: **Drug Courts (Program Purpose #10)**

The aim of this program is diverting less serious drug offenders from the criminal justice system into a supervision and treatment program administered by the county probation department. The program is broken into three phases. Phase I (immediate supervision) requires the defendant to attend orientation sessions with an assigned probation officer as well as attend group counseling sessions that focus on AIDs awareness and drug education. Phase II requirements are the same as Phase I; however, less frequent. Should the defendant successfully complete the diversion program without an relapse, criminal charges are dismissed and the offense (including the arrest) is erased from the criminal record. Phase III requires the defendant to continue drug treatment, counseling in educational opportunities, and job training. Currently three counties have implemented this program. This newly established program uses funds identified as local pass-through under the Byrne Block Grant Program. The program is administered by the California Administrative Office of the Courts, who exercises control over four additional project sites. These funds are used to establish or enhance existing drug courts in selected locations throughout California..

Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Provide immediate Phase I intervention to drug defendants.

Project participants must require the defendant to attend orientation sessions with the assigned probation officer, that includes group sessions, drug education and AIDs classes, and register with a community counseling program.

- Intensively supervise defendants participating in the drug court program.

Key activities in this intermediate stage of the program requires that the defendant complete the requirement are listed above. Upon successful completion of the diversion program, or at least three months without relapse, criminal charges will be dismissed, and criminal records will be expunged.

- Provide aftercare services to the defendant.

Activities will include the provision of services to the defendant that includes drug treatment, counseling in educational opportunities, and job training.

Year 2 Goal(s): Expand Drug Court to include under served/underrepresented locations throughout California. Place emphasis on locations with high non violent drug use and criminal offense trends.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue the expansion of the Drug Court Program.

Current Efforts

Program: **Intensive Supervision (Probation and Parole - Program Purpose #11)**

Three counties have implemented this program that is directed to a target population comprised of persons convicted of or adjudicated for a drug or drug-related offense, who are placed on probation subject to standard court-ordered conditions. The conditions must include, at a minimum, drug testing, counseling and/or treatment as directed by the court or the project probation officer, and appropriate searches as directed by the probation officer. Experience in this program shows an appropriate caseload ratio should be a minimum of 25, but no more than 35 per officer. Supervising officers must have flexible work schedules to include regularly scheduled night and weekend coverage for caseload visitation.

Projected Program Accomplishments: Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Probationers/Parolees must comply with court-ordered conditions of probation/parole.

Key activities include structured conditions that include drug testing, outpatient counseling/treatment, as directed by the court or project probation officer. Conduct appropriate searches by the probation officer. Other examinations will include physical examination which may be limited to ocular reaction and hypodermic mark examinations.

- Maintain officer-to-probationer/parolee caseload ratios to effectively implement the program.

The key element of this objective is to maintain a caseload ratio of a minimum of 25, but no more than 35 probationers per officer.

Year 2 Goal(s): Continue to hold probationers/parolee accountable under court-ordered conditions of probation.

Year 3 Goal(s): Reduce the number of probationer/parolee cases per probation officer.

Current Efforts

Program: Forensic Laboratory Enhancement (Program Purpose #15a)

One single component grant has implemented this program, whose focus is to positively impact the timely prosecution of targeted offenders by reducing the time required to analyze and report the results of project-related drug evidence.

**Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:**

- Increase the number of drug specimens analyzed.

Key activities will include project staff will perform analysis of drug evidence submitted by law enforcement agencies within California jurisdictions.

- Laboratory staff will obtain the minimum drug analysis turn-around time for test results reported to law enforcement, prosecution, or probation components.
A key activity under this objective is perform analysis on evidence submitted and return analytical findings within 48 hours of the arrest for cases identified as custody drug offenders.

Year 2 Goal(s): Continue to reduce laboratory analysis turn-around time.

Year 3 Goal(s): Provide portable laboratory analysis capability within project regions requiring the quickest response requirements for custody drug offenders.

Current Efforts

Program: Detention Alternatives (Program Purpose #20)

Projects currently funded for FY 1996/97 did not select this program title to address local needs. Therefore, a program abstract has not been developed. Program objectives, activities, and performance measures have not been determined necessary currently, as other more appropriate program title best suits the needs for currently funded projects. In the event that program targeted surveys, public meetings, and recommendation from the State Public Safety Director's Group determine that activities are necessary for this program, a program abstract and funding will be made available project locations who wish to address this federally authorized program purpose area.

Current Efforts

Program: Boot Camp Program (Program Purpose #11)

It is not anticipated that program efforts will be continued for this program beyond the FY 1996/97 funding period. Currently two project locations receive funding for Boot Camp efforts and are nearing project closure. A mandatory evaluation component requires either process/impact evaluation of the activities undertaken, to determine whether the program is viable and whether replication would be appropriate. The results of that evaluation will be discussed in the State Annual Report for FY 1997/98.

Projected Program Accomplishments: This program is being discontinued.

Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Implement a Phase I Boot Camp Program.

Key activities under this program currently requires participating projects to divert first-time non-violent youthful offenders into a comprehensive juvenile boot camp program. Activity setting must be under a modified military platoon design within 60 days from the receipt of project funding. Staff must be trained in military boot camp techniques, with emphasis in order and discipline. Additional training should include drill and ceremonies, chain of command, physical fitness, and the flag ceremony.

- Develop a cadet curriculum

Build self-fortifying skills to assist cadets with transition from incarceration to release. Provide guidance and support throughout this phase, providing counseling, when required and enforce discipline, as necessary. Emphasize behavioral change, rather than the imposition of punishment.

Goal: Dependent on the outcome of the evaluation, select demonstration sites that would benefit from the implementation of the Boot Camp approach.

Current Efforts

Program: High Risk Youth Program (Program Purpose #24)

This program will be discontinued at the close of the FY 1996/97 grant period. Similar to the Boot Camp Program, an evaluation of program successes will be undertaken at the conclusion of the program. Two project locations will be involved in this evaluation process. After the completion of the evaluation, the reports will be reviewed whether opportunities exist to identify other locations where these projects may be implemented.

This program was a three year pilot program that provided funding to two county probation departments for innovative high-risk youth projects. Approximately 265 high-risk youth are being served through this program. Projects will develop a collaboratively operated continuum of services network, offering prevention,

intervention, and treatment strategies to reduce gang violence, drug, and criminal behavior.

Projected Program Accomplishments: This program has been scheduled for discontinuation.
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Increase the capacity to serve high-risk youth and families in the community, which must result in the diversion of youth from further criminal justice system involvement.

Key activities of this program include active collaboration with the Departments of Health, Social Services, County Office of Education, and community-based agencies for a continuum of services extended to high-risk youth and their families. Services include assessment of need, individualized youth and family plans, anger management classes, structured and comprehensive school-based programs.

- Reduce the number of parents convicted for criminal activity, including child abuse reports, and improve family life skills and employability.

Key activities for this objective include the provision of therapeutic counseling for the youth and family member. Education will also be provided on subjects such as chemical dependency, family violence prevention, parenting, and child development.

Goal(s) Program will be discontinued at the end of FY 1996/97 grant award period, subject to favorable evaluation report findings. At this point, a determination will be made whether or not this program will be allocated funding for future program replication in other locations within California. The basis of program replication has yet to be determined.

Current Efforts

Program: Street Level Narcotic Enforcement (Program Purpose #21)

The intent of this program is to strengthen urban enforcement and prosecution efforts targeted at street-level drug sales, by creating a multi-disciplined program, coordinating the efforts of law enforcement, prosecution and probation personnel. This program is differs from multi-jurisdictional task forces operation, as the sole focus is the neutralization of street-level drug traffickers. One project implemented this strategy.

Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Issue arrest warrants and arrest individuals charged with drug or drug-related offenses.

Key activities for this objective include conducting undercover narcotic purchases, developing informants, arresting drug dealers, users, and

suppliers. Prosecution and law enforcement components of this program should coordinate efforts regarding arrest and search warrant activities.

- Seize assets of drug or drug-related offenders.

Actively pursue seizures of assets and weapons in the possession of drug offenders.

Year 2 Goal(s): Continue strengthening urban enforcement and prosecution efforts targeted at street level drug sales.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue and replicate the Street Level Narcotics Enforcement Program. Provide funding opportunities to counties identifying street level drug dealers.

Current Efforts

Program: Nuisance Abatement Program (Program Purpose #21)

Currently, this program is not being funded, nor have program activities or abstracts been developed. This special program has been presented as an optional program activity for county prosecutors to identify and investigate buildings or places proven to be a public or private nuisance. The methods used in the abatement process are governed by California Health and Safety Code Sections 11570 through 11587. The goal of this program is to revitalize neighborhoods by combining drug law enforcement and local ordinance code enforcement, with community volunteers to improve the residential area and eliminate drug activity from the target location.

Goal(s): None planned.

Priority Two: Provide funding support and guidance for statewide coordination of narcotic interdiction efforts

Priority Statement: Narcotic interdiction efforts would have little or no effect without coordinating the many varying activities undertaken to circumvent narcotics trafficking statewide. The use of Byrne Block Grant funds to support the Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE) is critical to California's comprehensive strategy. BNE provides the expertise and resources necessary to interdict the flow of drugs into California from outside our borders, as well as providing trained staff in support of local task force and local law enforcement efforts.

Current Efforts

Program: Multijurisdictional Task Force Program (Program Purpose #2)

Projects in need of additional resources coordinate with the State Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE). BNE has experienced special agent supervisors as task force commanders in numerous ADA funded projects throughout the state. BNE is also the lead agency responsible for statewide efforts directed at identifying the major distributors of cocaine and marijuana in California. Programs conducted by BNE include the following:

- Clandestine Laboratory Enforcement Program;
- Precursor Compliance Program;
- Financial Investigations Program;
- Diversion Program;
- Triplicate Prescription Program;
- Campaign Against Marijuana Planting Program (CAMP)
- Statewide Integrated Narcotics System (SINS); and
- Violence Suppression Program.

Coordination of Byrne Block Grant funds activities with state agencies receiving federal funds has enhanced statewide drug coordination efforts. State agencies include the Department of Alcohol and Drug Program, Department of Justice, Department of Corrections, Department of the Youth Authority, and the California Highway Patrol. These agencies provide either direct resources to our projects or provide programs that address gaps in service not addressed by the ADA Program thereby strengthening the statewide drug effort.

Projected Program Accomplishments: Major objectives and key activities have been stated previously in the introduction of this section.

Priority Three: Continue Operation Revitalization (Weed and Seed) efforts in drug plagued communities

Priority Statement: Communities that have not rallied together in a united front against violent crime and illegal drugs remain vulnerable to indiscriminate acts of further violence as a result. Quality of life issues affecting one citizen often affects the rest of the community as well

Current Efforts

Program: Operation Revitalization Program (Program Purpose #16)

Operation Revitalization is a comprehensive, multi-agency approach to combating violent crime, drug use, and gang activity in high-crime neighborhoods. The goals are to “weed out” crime from targeted neighborhoods, create a “bridge” between law enforcement and the target community to work collaboratively, and then “seed” the target site with a wide range of crime and drug prevention programs and human service agency resources to prevent crime from recurring. All components (law enforcement and schools), must work together in partnership with the people of the target area to remove violent criminals and eliminate drug

activity from the area, prevent criminal activity from returning to the target area, and rebuild institutions, activities and family life within the community. For FY 1996/97, nine sites are funded.

Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Implement suppression activities in the target area by planning and executing tactical action plans to apprehend offenders.

Key activities include the identification of drug, gang, and violent crime elements to be addressed.

- Prosecute arrestees to the fullest extent of the law.

Activities include city, county, and state prosecutors using a full array of prosecutorial techniques to incapacitate arrestees for the maximum possible sentence.

- Establish a Suppression of Drug Abuse in Schools Local Advisory Committee

A key activity of this advisory committee is to oversee the implementation of a coordinated prevention, intervention, and treatment strategy.

- Develop a Drug Intervention Program.

A key activity of this objective is to arrest juvenile for possession/sale of drugs and to dedicate law enforcement officer time to school campuses, to include classroom time.

- Integrate existing community-based programs to empower residents in target area to overcome drug, crime, and socioeconomic problems.

Acquire input from local residents and OR Steering Committee and project staff to define community needs and locate existing resources.

- Develop and implement a reclamation/revitalization action plan/priorities, that includes local businesses.

Coordinate community staff efforts to beautify neighborhoods, through graffiti abatement, nuisance removal, and physical structure rehabilitation.

Year 2 Goal(s): Continue Operation Revitalization Program, using all component strategies, e.g., suppression, community policing, prevention, intervention, treatment, and reclamation and revitalization.

Integrate program outcomes into continuing program activities while increasing the quality of program services in targeted communities.

Replicate program in communities having the capacity to implement all components under the Operation Revitalization Program

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue to replicate OR Program in communities throughout California.

Develop statistical databases from non-criminal justice resources in order to track the progress or decline of program efforts in neighborhoods within jurisdictions.

Priority Four: **Maintain an effective statewide presence with efforts under the Substance Abuse Treatment Program**

Priority Statement: State and national trends indicate an ever increasing trend of criminality as being closely associated with drug abuse. Booking facilities throughout California report that offenders screened for drug use confirms this trend. Within juvenile and adult offenders, of the 10 offenders booked into correctional/detention facilities, seven were under the influence at the time the offense was committed. Often, the offender has habituated to more than one drug (poly-drugs). As prison populations increase, so will this trend. As these offenders are released, they reoffend, continue to abuse drugs, and are subsequently reintroduced back into the criminal justice system. The cycle continues.

Current Efforts

Program: Comprehensive substance abuse programs for parolees provide an additional link in addressing the statewide drug problem from a treatment perspective. Effective coordination between corrections and treatment providers has shown some success in reducing recidivism among parolees upon release into our communities.

Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Provide pre-parole planning for in-prison program participants.

A key activity under this objective to develop an appropriate program plan through joint collaborative efforts between the offender, parole agent, and treatment personnel.

- Provide substance abuse treatment services to offenders graduating from the in-prison component.

Activities are centered around the successful participant's completion of the in-prison program. Participants are referred to the aftercare treatment program. Staff and treatment professional

conduct counseling sessions to determine when the participant can successfully re-enter society.

- Provide parole supervision

Parole/probation officer must assure that parolees/probationers receive urinalysis testing on a frequent basis. Community service and employment are other necessary activities performed by the program participant.

Year 2 Goal(s): Provide treatment services maintenance activities to graduates of community treatment programs

Provide community-based residential aftercare services to substance abuse offenders with the aim of successfully eliminating the drug use and criminal activities of the offender.

Year 3 Goal(s): Expand treatment program services to prisons and jails.

Priority Five: **Eradicate outdoor and indoor marijuana cultivation and production in California**

Priority Statement: California youth, as well as the adult abuser, have continued to maintain an attitude of indifference toward the harmful effects of illegal drugs, especially marijuana, the commonly termed “gateway drug”. Marijuana cultivation, coupled with the criminality and associated violence, threatens the well-being of the citizens of the state. Recently approved and chaptered California legislation (Proposition 215), may also cause an upsurge in abuse of this illegal drug, with possible program implications concerning enforcement.

Current Efforts

Program: **Marijuana Eradication (Program Purpose #3)**

ADA funded projects conduct investigations using information from citizens, confidential informants, and obtain search warrants to eradicate marijuana cultivation sites. Investigative methods used to confiscate marijuana gardens include ground and aerial reconnaissance and surveillance. Projects are required to coordinate, schedule, and conduct training for new project officers assigned to marijuana investigations. Project prosecutors handle task force generated cases and initiate asset forfeiture proceedings. Coordination with the federal Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and the Drug Enforcement Administration significantly enhance our efforts. Presently 12 counties receive funding for this program.

Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- Suppress marijuana cultivation through comprehensive detection and eradication effort.

Key activities include conducting investigations by using information obtained from citizens and informants; and obtaining search warrants, to eradicate marijuana grow sites.

- Investigate drug trafficking organizations (DTOs) involved in marijuana cultivation.

Conduct ground and aerial surveillance of cultivation sites; coordinate with other law enforcement agencies for the efficient use of intelligence information and resource sharing.

- Seize, for forfeiture proceedings, assets of cultivators and traffickers.

An important activity for this objective is to conduct financial investigations for civil forfeiture proceedings to obtain the assets derived through the criminal enterprise.

Year 2 Goal(s): Eliminate all marijuana cultivation sites and locations in California.

Continue marijuana eradication efforts through the Marijuana Suppression Program.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue program activities that supports the complete elimination of illegal cultivation and production of marijuana in California.

Priority Six: Expand efforts aimed toward improving California’s Criminal Justice Information System

Priority Statement: Although vastly improved, criminal and applicant record information remains incomplete and inaccurate. Handling paper documents creates a dependence on personnel resources for process management and also creates the potential for lost and misplaced documentation. Incomplete records and lengthy processing time means slower response to law enforcement and domestic inquiries and a lack of availability of criminal record information needed so urgently by law enforcement.

Current Efforts

Program: **Criminal Justice Information Systems**

Instant access to offenders criminal history data is critical to law enforcement’s ability to effectively combat illegal drugs and drug-related crimes of violence. The Department of Justice, Bureau of Identification and Information (BCII) continues to develop a “paperless” processing system for electronic fingerprint records, including automated update of their Automated Criminal History System, Master Name Index, and

Automated Fingerprint Identification System. This project fulfills the mandated requirement for the 5% set-aside for criminal history improvements.

Additional funding is provided to the City of Hawthorne to expand and upgrade the Statewide Integrated Narcotics System (SINS) for Southern California law enforcement agencies. Participating agencies have access to relational databases containing intelligence on suspected drug dealers. Two sites are funded under this program.

**Projected Program Accomplishments:
Major Objectives and Key Activities:**

- Develop paperless processing of electronic fingerprint records, including the Automated Criminal History System (ACHS), Master Name Index (MNI), and the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS).

Key activities include development of specifications, programming, and preliminary testing for new and expanded systems.

- Implement a fully automated system to update the California Criminal History System, including court disposition information.

A key activity for this objective includes developing specifications for law enforcement and prosecution record types; and edit capability for CHRIS.

- Update operational software for data validation.

A key activity for this objective is to acquire software vendors (contractors) for updating and designing data software validation

Year 2 Goal(s): Update and improve the California Criminal Justice Information System;

Continue to expand the resource acquisition capability of CJIS to include the expansion of an “open system” capability.

Provide capabilities for the “transfer of knowledge” to local users for the efficient use of information nodes located in regions throughout California.

Year 3 Goal(s): Continue to expand the capabilities of CJIS to include the Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System (SWBSADIS);

Extend the “connectivity” capability of California’s CJIS to include other national criminal information databases.

Priority Seven: **Provide continuing legal education and training to criminal justice professionals on subjects involving drugs and violent crime.**

Priority Statement: California prosecutors continually face changing interpretation of criminal and civil law, differences in judicial reviews and interpretations, and evolving prosecution and investigative techniques. The result leads to the need for continuing legal education for prosecutors that is essential in maintaining a high level of prosecutorial effectiveness statewide.

Current Efforts

Program: **Domestic and Family Violence Program (Program Purpose #18)**

This program provides topical continuing legal education and training to all local and state prosecutors on subject areas that include domestic/family violence and sexual assault prosecution skills. The California District Attorney's Association (CDAA) provides training seminars on emergent issues and advanced prosecutorial/defense topics to prosecutors and public defenders. Additionally, they assist county prosecutors and public defenders in the areas of continuing legal education and training. CDAA is required to update published materials/periodicals and the Continuing Legal Education Videotape Library and Master Index. One project is funded under this statewide training program.

Projected Program Accomplishments:

Major Objectives and Key Activities:

- A major objective of this program is to assist public prosecutors and defenders by providing continuing education and training at training seminars that address emergent issues/advanced topics regarding domestic and family violence.

A key activity that supports this objective is that the CDAA must develop and present scheduled seminars.

- Produce, update, and maintain published materials for training. The CDAA must continue the distribution of existing training manuals/materials to interest prosecutors and public defenders.
- Produce topic-specific prosecutors gang training programs that covers subjects, vertical prosecution, gang identification and witness intimidation.

Production activities includes the active collaboration between the CDAA program consultant, program technical advisors, and the CDAA Gang Violence Committee, to determine training seminar strengths, weaknesses, and to make revisions, as required.

- Produce a specific prosecutors sexual assault program, covering subjects related to child sexual assault and adult sexual assault.

A key activity includes the coordination program training and development actions with the CDAA Sexual Assault Committee and select OCJP and State Advisory committee representatives.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR BYRNE FUNDED PROGRAMS

Since the establishment of OCJP's Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Branch, early evaluation capabilities were limited to determining whether or not funded projects complied with program criteria. Since then, program priorities have expanded, if not increased. As reported in earlier Annual Reports, the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Branch has expanded, to include the application of scientific research, as it applies to all programs for which OCJP is responsible. Currently, the branch has increased the number of assigned staff to monitor/examine projects, but research analysts and specialists to conduct more specific and program targeted evaluations. This additional capability will not diminish the need or use of outside evaluation consultants to conduct impact and process evaluation. When this occurs, OCJP evaluation staff will work with planning and working groups within the agency, as well as local projects during the implementation of the evaluation design. Currently, OCJP is responsible for participating in the national and statewide evaluations of the following programs:

- Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Program;
- Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Program;
- Byrne Formula Block Grant Program; and
- Medical Forensic Evaluation Program

In preparation for the expansion of the evaluation capacities of OCJP, tentative priorities have been established as it relates to Byrne funded programs. Mechanisms are currently under development that will fit well within evaluation requirement frameworks for the multiyear strategy, as well as other federally funded programs. Although the agency evaluation plan is currently under development, the concept discussed herein is a visionary approach to future efforts. Progress being made toward that end will be reported in future strategy updates.

Preliminary Concepts for Byrne Funded Evaluations

OCJP is proposing a feasibility study for Fiscal Year 1997/98, to determine the parameters of a comprehensive evaluation of the Byrne formula Block Grant Program administered by the SAA. The feasibility study will include a preliminary assessment and proposed recommendations including the following:

- An overview of all components, e.g., law enforcement, prosecution, probation, and optional courts, including appropriate goals, activities, and performance measures;
- Review of data sources and data gaps;
- Identify mutually supporting functional areas which can be used for evaluation purposes (similarities and differences will also be assessed);
- Develop evaluation methodologies which take into consideration geographical areas, population centers, crime patterns, and diverse populations within the State of California;
- Based upon evaluation methodologies, analyze the needs for additional data collection and reporting methods; and

- Develop and recommend the scope, process, and related costs (estimated at \$250,000 per evaluation), for a comprehensive evaluation for Fiscal Year 1998/99 and future years.

The following outlines the primary component (program titles) and overall evaluations, including proposed evaluation sites for Fiscal Year 1998/99 and future years:

- Multijurisdictional Task Force Program (DC)

The evaluation will consist of a representative sampling of diverse counties within the state. This sampling may include the following:

- * Northern rural projects;
- * Central Valley projects;
- * Large urban/coastal projects; and
- * Southern Border projects

- Operation Revitalization Programs [OR](Weed & Seed)

A sampling of all OR projects that would be operating in California. This sampling may include the following:

- * City of Oxnard (Coastal region);
- * City of Roseville (Central Valley region);and
- * City of Westminster (Southern region)

- Marijuana Suppression Program (MS)

A sampling of all MSP projects in California that may include the following:

- * Mendocino County;
- * Monterey County;
- * San Bernardino County; and
- * Sonoma County

- California Department of Justice (DOJ) Programs

The following programs will be included in program evaluations for this period:

- * Violence Suppression;
- * Criminal History and Records Information system (CHRIS);
- * California Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement (BNE);
- * California Department of Corrections (Office of Substance Abuse Programs)
In-Custody and Residential Treatment Programs
- * California Judicial Council (CJC)
- * California Youth Authority (CYA) - Treatment/Alternative Sentencing Programs

In the appropriate Byrne funded program area, evaluations will attempt to determine if the distribution of federal funds is achieving the intended goals of the Byrne Formula Block Grant Program. Within this tentative framework, the OCJP Evaluation Plan Concept adapts shows the potential for effectively supporting the recently established multiyear strategy for the Byrne Formula Block Grant Program, as it links currently funded program to the evaluation plan.

